



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 26, 1999

No. 106

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 26, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM GIBBONS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, almighty God, that we will have the maturity and the spiritual insight to realize that Your goodness and Your blessings come to us not because of our righteousness, but because of Your grace to all people. Give us, O God, a greater sense of humility in our minds and a wonderful simplicity of faith so that we see more clearly the wonder and the majesty and the grandeur of Your gifts to us. For Your love to us and Your reconciling spirit, for Your peace that passes all human understanding, we offer this prayer of thanksgiving and praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NORWOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1480. An act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to

the bill (H.R. 1480) "An Act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mrs. BOXER, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 900) "An Act to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MACK, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. EDWARDS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENCOURAGE MINERAL DEVELOPMENT, NOT TAX IT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, time and time again we have heard the opponents of the 1872 mining law come

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6355

down to the well and state that the United States is the only major country which does not charge a Federal royalty for mining on government land. These same anti-mining critics want to add a 5 to 10 percent tax on all U.S. mineral production.

A recent survey was conducted on 17 major mining countries that compete with the United States. These 17 countries account for about 85 percent of all metal and minerals produced by the free world market economy. The average royalty they pay in these 17 countries surveyed was just under 1 percent, that is right, less than 1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must remain competitive internationally, and these proposed changes to the mining law would not allow us to do so. The United States is already a net importer of most minerals. Why is it that we are so worried about the trade deficit, and here we are talking about potential legislation that would render us completely dependent upon foreign nations for necessary goods and minerals that could be produced right here at home?

Mr. Speaker, Congress would be wise to encourage mineral development to offset the trade deficit and our dependence on foreign countries. In the meantime, this would create jobs, thereby increasing tax revenues and lowering social costs to the government.

SHOULD A GYMNASIUM FOR THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT COST \$85 MILLION?

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Army has requested an \$85 million construction project for a gymnasium at the United States Military Academy at West Point. Apparently the showers are to be gold-plated, since the average cost for a military physical fitness facility is \$7 million. This request is outrageous.

I am advised that the Army has requested no family housing construction, yet an \$85 million gym enjoys priority status.

Only last week the Republican tax package emphasized the significance of taxpayers retaining more of their hard-earned money. This approach emphasizes compassion and common sense, while the Army struts front and center demanding an \$85 million gymnasium.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to redirect our priorities and practice prudence in lieu of recklessness.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that it will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to

suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later today.

LAKE OCONEE LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 604) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a land exchange with Georgia Power Company.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 604

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act".

SEC. 2. LAKE OCONEE LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DESCRIPTION OF THE BOUNDARY.—The term "description of the boundary" means the documents entitled "Description of the Boundary" dated September 6, 1996, prepared by the Forest Service and on file with the Secretary.

(2) EXCHANGE AGREEMENT.—The term "exchange agreement" means the agreement between Georgia Power Company and the Forest Service dated December 26, 1996, as amended on August 17, 1998, on file with the Secretary.

(3) GEORGIA POWER COMPANY.—The term "Georgia Power Company" means Georgia Power Company, a division of the Southern Company, a Georgia corporation, or its successors or assigns.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Simultaneously with conveyance by Georgia Power Company to the Secretary of all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(A) convey to Georgia Power Company all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in paragraph (3), except as provided in the exchange agreement; and

(B) make a value equalization payment of \$23,250 to Georgia Power Company.

(2) LAND TO BE CONVEYED TO THE SECRETARY.—The land described in this paragraph is the land within or near the Chattahoochee National Forest and Oconee National Forest in the State of Georgia, comprising approximately 1,175.46 acres, described in the exchange agreement and the description of the boundary.

(3) LAND TO BE CONVEYED TO GEORGIA POWER COMPANY.—The land described in this paragraph is the land in the State of Georgia, comprising approximately 1,275.80 acres, described in the exchange agreement and the description of the boundary.

(c) PARTIAL REVOCATION OF WITHDRAWALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The orders issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under section 24 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 818), authorizing Power Project Numbers 2413 and 2354, issued August 6, 1969, and October 1, 1996, respectively, are revoked insofar as the orders affect the land described in subsection (b)(3).

(2) NO ANNUAL CHARGE.—No interest conveyed to Georgia Power Company or easement right retained by Georgia Power Com-

pany under this section shall be subject to an annual charge for the purpose of compensating the United States for the use of its land for power purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act, which would enact a mutually beneficial exchange of land between the USDA Forest Service and the Georgia Power Company.

The exchange would result in consolidation and more efficient management of national forests, increased protection of wildlife and habitats, and improved recreational access for citizens.

The Forest Service will exchange Forest Service lands that lie under Lake Oconee behind Georgia Power's Wallace Dam on the Oconee River in northern Georgia, flood rights on contour strips around the lake, and two parcels in neighboring counties, in exchange for lands Georgia Power owns within the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests.

The exchange involves approximately 1,200 acres of Forest Service land for approximately 1,100 acres of Georgia Power land.

The exchange will allow the Forest Service to acquire one of two remaining non-Federal properties within congressionally designated wilderness areas in north Georgia. This tract is in the middle of the Rich Mountain Wilderness, and totally surrounded by other National Forest lands.

The vast majority of lands to be transferred by the Forest Service lie at the bottom of Lake Oconee and are not actively conveying any public benefit. The remainder of the properties being relinquished to Georgia Power is currently occupied by Georgia Power facilities in Rabun County. These properties are of minimal value to the National Forest, and would be more appropriately owned by Georgia Power.

The Forest Service, as detailed by the Forest Supervisor's Decision Memo, has determined that the transfer complies with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and is supportive of the bill.

In addition, 67 percent of the lands of Rabun County are currently part of the Chattahoochee National Forest. This concentrated ownership poses a considerable strain on the ad valorem tax base of Rabun County. Included within the land exchange is the conveyance to Georgia Power Company of over 145 acres of property in Rabun County that currently houses Georgia Power facilities. The divestment of this property will facilitate Rabun County and their problem with their limited tax base.

I urge Members' support of this legislation, with the assurance that this exchange will allow improved management by both parties, resulting in increased environmental protection and enjoyable utilization by all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 604, the Oconee Land Exchange Act. The companion bill in the House is H.R. 1135.

The Oconee Land Exchange Act would require the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a land exchange with the Georgia Power Company. Provisions of S. 604 allow the National Forest Service to acquire five tracts of land in a single transfer, while conveying four tracts of land of equal value to the Georgia Power Company.

This bill eliminates the need to preserve and maintain over 20 miles of boundary line and seven property corners, saving the National Forest Service \$10,160 over a 10-year period.

This bill requires the Federal Government to pay \$23,250 to the Georgia Power Company, which is the difference between the appraised value of the Forest Service transfer to Georgia Power and the appraised value of the 1,175 acres of land being conveyed by Georgia Power Company to the Forest Service.

S. 604 gives full consideration to the opportunity to achieve better management of National Forest lands and resources by consolidation of split estates. Under this transfer, the Forest Service will be acquiring from Georgia Power Company 50.71 acres of land, less flood rights.

Presently, the Forest Service and Georgia Power manage a meandering boundary that separates the National Forest from the shoreline of the lake owned by Georgia Power Company. The exchange under consideration would eliminate 20.3 miles of boundary lines and seven property corners. By acquiring this specific tract of land, the Nation's forest lands would be extended to the water's edge, instead of following a meandering boundary around the flood pool of the lake.

According to the National Forest Service, this meandering contour area has been a management problem since the lake's inception. Federal acquisition of these 50.7 acres of land less flood rights will allow the Forest Service to manage to the edge of the lake without interfering with the rights of Georgia Power.

Under this exchange, the National Forest Service would acquire a 625 acre tract wedged between the Oconee National Forest and the Piedmont National Wildlife Management Area, and an additional 157-acre property would become part of the Oconee National Forest.

These lands would add approximately 179 acres of wetlands and provide recov-

ery habitat for the red cockaded woodpecker, an endangered species.

Furthermore, the Forest Service would acquire from Georgia Power a 173.4 acre tract within a congressionally designated wilderness area located in the middle of Rich Mountain Wilderness, and totally surrounded by other National Forest land.

The Georgia Power Company will acquire 1275.8 acres of land owned by the National Forest Service, along with an easement right to flood 240.84 acres of National Forest in the flood pool of Lake Oconee. This conveyance includes a small unmanageable remnant, a 1.6 acre tract, and a second tract that adds land lines and boundary corners while serving only minimal National Forest purposes.

This transfer will permit the public lands to be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resources and archeological values.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as a Georgian I rise today in support of the Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act, which would enact a mutually beneficial exchange of the land between the USDA Forest Service and the Georgia Power Company. The exchange would result in consolidation and more efficient management of National Forests, increased protection of wildlife and habitat, and improved recreational access for all our citizens.

The Forest Service will exchange Forest Service land that lie under Lake Oconee, behind Georgia Power's Wallace Dam on the Oconee River in northern Georgia, flood rights on contour strips around the lakes, and two parcels in neighboring counties, in exchange for lands Georgia Power owns within the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests.

(1415)

The exchange involves approximately 1,200 acres of Forest Service land for approximately 1,100 acres of Georgia Power land.

The exchange will allow the Forest Service to acquire one of two remaining non-Federal properties within congressionally designated wilderness areas in north Georgia. This tract is in the middle of the Rich Mountain Wilderness and totally surrounded by other National Forest lands.

The vast majority of lands being given up by the Forest Service lies at the bottom of Lake Oconee and are not actively conveying any public benefit. The remainder of the properties being relinquished to Georgia Power are currently occupied by Georgia Power facilities in Rabun County. These prop-

erties are of minimal value to the National Forest and would be more appropriately owned by Georgia Power.

In addition, 67 percent of the lands of Rabun County are currently part of the Chattahoochee National Forest. This concentrated ownership poses a considerable strain on the ad valorem tax base of Rabun County. Included within the land exchange is the conveyance to Georgia Power Company of over 145 acres of property in Rabun County that currently houses Georgia Power facilities. The divestment of this property will facilitate Rabun County and their properties with their limited tax base.

As the primary sponsor of the House companion bill, H.R. 1135, I urge my colleagues' support for this legislation with the assurance that this exchange will allow improved management by both parties, resulting in increased environmental protection and actually more enjoyable utilizations by the citizens.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of the House version of this bill, and I rise in support of the Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act to improve the management of the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests.

For some time, there has been an awkward patchwork of land ownership between the USDA Forest Service and the Georgia Power Company. The current land arrangement includes a meandering boundary around the flood pool of Lake Oconee and even a 173.4 acre tract of Georgia Power land in the middle of the Rich Mountain Wilderness. These twisting boundaries and scattered patches of private and public land make it difficult for Forest Service personnel to efficiently carry out their management activities.

This land exchange will allow the Forest Service to consolidate its holdings within the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests, and will simplify the administration of the Forests' borders. This consolidation will be achieved through the Forest Service acquiring one of two remaining non-Federal properties within congressionally designated wilderness areas in North Georgia. Forest boundaries around Lake Oconee will be improved by extending National Forest lands to the water's edge, instead of following the meandering border of the flood pool of the lake.

These changes will allow the Forest Service to better manage prescribed burns in the Oconee National Forest. Presently, the Forest Service has to bulldoze trenches along its meandering border with Georgia Power to ensure the controlled fires do not spread to

private lands. Bulldozing trenches requires a commitment of valuable personnel and heavy equipment and carries a risk of releasing excessive silt into Lake Oconee.

The increased efficiency of management of National Forests allowed by this land exchange will lead to reduced risk to Forest Service personnel and improved preservation of habitat and wildlife.

The Forest Service will gain a habitat for the red-cockaded woodpecker and a quality trout stream, and the Georgia Nature Conservancy and the Georgia Wildlife Federation have informed me of their support for this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in passing this legislation.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 604.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 604, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CLARIFYING EXPORT-IMPORT BANK BOARD REQUIREMENTS

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2565) to clarify the quorum requirement for the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2565

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF QUORUM REQUIREMENT FOR THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c)(6) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(c)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) A quorum of the Board of Directors shall consist of at least 3 members.”

(b) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding section 3(c)(6) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, if, during the period that begins on July 21, 1999, and ends on October 1, 1999, there are fewer than 3 persons holding office on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import

Bank of the United States, the entire membership of such Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum until the end of such period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2565, a bill to clarify the quorum requirements for the Export-Import Bank of the United States. This bill is designed to remedy a serious problem that has developed with regard to vacancies in Ex-Im's Board of Directors. Without prompt congressional action, this situation could result in the suspension of the Bank's ability to make new financial commitments and jeopardize billions of dollars in pending U.S. export transactions.

The background is as follows: The Bank's charter requires a quorum of its five-member board in order to conduct business. Prior to July 20, two vacancies existed on the board. On July 21, the term of a third board member expired.

Although there is some ambiguity as to whether the quorum requirement refers to a majority of the statutorily prescribed five-person board or, instead, to a majority of board members currently in office, the former interpretation is legally preferable.

As explained in legal analysis provided by the General Accounting Office, the quorum requirement for the five-member board necessarily requires at least three members to be present and transact the board's business. Thus, with only two incumbent members, the board lacks its legally required quorum.

This unfortunate problem is compounded by the fact that no nominations have been made for these vacancies, nor has any intent to nominate been sent to the other body. In this awkward circumstance, Congress has no alternative but to act expeditiously to advance the Nation's interest and remedy this situation. Failure to do so would put America's exports and American jobs at risk.

Therefore, H.R. 2565 clarifies Ex-Im's charter by explicitly providing that a quorum of the board shall consist of three members. At the same time, it provides the Bank with authority to continue operations with only two members of the board until October 1 of this year. This brief window should provide sufficient time for the administration to forward qualified nominees and for their expeditious consideration in the other body.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) for his leadership and cooperation on this issue. Likewise, I would like to express my appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CAL-

LAHAN), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, may I clarify for the RECORD that, unfortunately, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) wanted to be here today to support this legislation, but his plane has been tied up, and he is unable to make it and asked me to substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2565. This legislation, as amended, permits the Export-Import Bank to operate with only two board members until October 1, 1999. During this interim period, the other body should be in a position to confirm additional board members.

This legislation is necessary to allow the bank to make legally-binding financing commitments on nearly \$7 billion in pending U.S. export transactions. Mr. Speaker, in this era of record trade deficits, we must ensure that significant export transactions continue uninterrupted. Continued operation of the Export-Import Bank will allow U.S. companies to compete on a level playing field with their counterparts in other industrialized nations, who also have access to the important export financing tools, such as loan guarantees, that are offered by the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for sponsoring this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) for his assistance on this issue and for his long-time quality representation on the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

This is an issue primarily between the Executive Branch and the other body, but it is something that requires a shift in law, and this body, I think, at this time ought to recognize that particular problem and move as cooperatively as possible with the other body and the Executive Branch in this issue.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2565, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF RECORDS ON MISSING PERSONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 172) to authorize and direct the Archivist of the United States to make available for public use the records of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 172

Resolved, That the Archivist of the United States is authorized and directed to make available for public use the records of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia (94th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the question of a final resolution on military and, indeed, even civilian personnel in Southeast Asia, principally in Vietnam, has been one that this country has wrestled with for some time.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) was a member of the Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia during that Select Committee's existence in the 1970s. That particular committee was dissolved in the 94th Congress, and portions of its records, including 20 executive sessions, were, according to the appropriate procedures at the time, sealed for 50 years. Less sensitive records were sealed for 30 years.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Subcommittee on Trade, it was my pleasure a few years ago to travel with then subcommittee Chairman Sam Gibbons on the first official congressional visit to Vietnam prior to our recognition of that country. We spent 2 days in Hawaii being briefed on the extensive, laborious, scientific pursuit of all leads in terms of missing in action and prisoners of war. We also carried on a number of discussions with Vietnamese officials and with individuals in the private sector, indeed loved ones who had sons, daughters, husbands, missing in that war.

It just seems appropriate, according to H. Res. 172, that the conditions in which we now relate to the country of Vietnam, as it pertains to records that were sealed, would only make it more difficult to conclude once and for all the question of prisoners of war and

missing in action. In fact, opening up reports so that any number of people can examine and find leads they find most appropriate, especially the ability to move into the country and talk to individuals, would maximize the opportunity for closing this particular chapter in America's history.

For that reason, and especially since the Senate has already taken similar action, I would urge all Members to support H. Res. 172.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), and others who cosponsored this resolution and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the House Committee on Administration, in support of House Resolution 172.

□ 1430

This action, hopefully, will help both historians, researchers and, most of all, loved ones of missing American servicemen in Southeast Asia; and we should strive, when at all possible, for a policy of openness with respect to the records of loved ones who fought overseas on behalf of our country.

Simply put, this resolution would declassify the records of the House Select Committee on Missing Persons. It would authorize and direct the archivist of the United States to make these records available to the public.

In the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee investigated and tried to determine whether American servicemen had, in fact, been left behind in Southeast Asia after the Vietnam War. As has been explained, House rules mandated when the Select Committee was dissolved that its records be kept secret for 50 years. Similar rules governed the records of the Senate Select Committee that studied the same issue.

However, several years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Senate agreed to reduce the period of secrecy to 20 years and, thus, directed all its committee files be declassified. We should do the same thing, and we should do it for two principle reasons:

First, the families and loved ones of missing servicemen in Southeast Asia deserve and ought to know what the House Select Committee uncovered, and they should not have to wait even another day. These families should not have to fight their government on the release of these files, particularly since many of their loved ones fought so valiantly, so bravely, on behalf of our government, our people, and our commitment to democracy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that secrecy only fuels suspicion. While there are, of course, secrets the government must keep for national security reasons, this is not the case in this instance. As the Senate Select Com-

mittee stated in its final report, and I quote, "Nothing has done more to fuel suspicion about the government's handling of the POW-MIA issue than the fact that so many documents related to those efforts have remained classified for so long."

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to end that suspicion, and we certainly should do it. I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who introduced this resolution, and I am pleased to rise on behalf of its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the principal sponsor of H. Res. 172, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I am pleased to rise today in support of H. Res. 172, a measure designed to declassify the records of the House Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia.

I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), as well as the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for allowing this bill to be brought to the floor under suspension of the rules in this timely manner.

I helped to create and served as a member of the Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia during the 94th Congress. At that time the Select Committee was tasked with the responsibility of determining whether American servicemen had been left behind in Southeast Asia after the Vietnam War.

When the Select Committee was dissolved, after completing its work, some 35 boxes of material were sent over to the National Archives and Records Administration. Of that total, 11 boxes contained classified information. This material was subject to House classification rules, which mandated that the material be kept classified for a period of 50 years.

Earlier this decade, the Senate Committee on POW and MIA Affairs declassified all of its files on this issue, making them open to both the families and to researchers. This legislation simply allows the House to follow suit by making a change in House rules and opening all of the Select Committee's files and boxes of material to the public.

In approving this measure for suspension, the committee staff expressed some concern that privacy rights might be compromised if the files were declassified. They were subsequently

assured by the archivist that any cases where privacy is a concern, such as an individual who testified on conditions of anonymity, would be honored and such files would not be made public.

Mr. Speaker, the end of the Cold War has resulted in the discovery of literally hundreds of documents which had previously been out of reach behind the Iron Curtain. I see no need for the House to maintain a veil of secrecy over its Select Committee files, especially when such information may provide some insight into the fate of some of the more than 2,000 service members who still remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam conflict.

Accordingly, I ask my colleagues to join in supporting this worthy legislation which would bring the House rules on this subject in accord with those of our counterpart committee in the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time, once again thanking the gentleman from New York for this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time, adding that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) asked me to make his comments known and his expressions of appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others for their leadership on this, and he joins us very strongly in supporting this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 172.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORGAN DONOR LEAVE ACT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 457) to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the amount of leave time available to a Federal employee in any year in connection with serving as an organ donor, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 457

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INCREASED LEAVE TIME TO SERVE AS AN ORGAN DONOR.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Organ Donor Leave Act".

(b) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of the first section 6327 of title 5, United States Code (relating to absence in connection with serving as a bone-marrow or organ donor) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) An employee may, in any calendar year,—

"(1) not to exceed 7 days of leave under this section to serve as a bone-marrow donor; and

"(2) not to exceed 30 days of leave under this section to serve as an organ donor.".

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The second section 6327 of title 5, United States Code (relating to absence in connection with funerals of fellow Federal law enforcement officers) is redesignated as section 6328.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 6327 the following:

"6328. Absence in connection with funerals of fellow Federal law enforcement officers.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 457.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 457, the Organ Donor Leave Act. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for introducing this important bill. I know that my colleagues in the House are strong supporters of organ donation; but whenever we have a chance to highlight this important issue, we should do so.

More than 54,000 people are currently on the organ transplant waiting list, and about 4,000 each year die while waiting for a transplant. I believe that Congress should do whatever it can do to encourage our citizens to consider becoming organ or bone marrow donors and that the Federal Government should be a leader in this effort.

The Organ Donor Leave Act does that. Mr. Speaker, the least we can do for those who are giving so much of themselves is to give them the time to rest and recover with their families as they save the lives of others.

H.R. 457 will make it easier for Federal employees to become organ donors by providing those who donate organs with 30 days of paid leave in any calendar year. Under current law, employees are permitted to take 7 days of leave in order to donate bone marrow or organs.

H.R. 457 retains the 7-day leave period for bone marrow donors but increases the leave available to organ donors to 30 days. This leave is separate and distinct from the annual or sick leave available to Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Illinois has been a leader in organ and tissue donation through our Secretary of State's office. In fact, I signed up as a potential organ donor when our Secretary of State, now Governor George Ryan, came to the House floor of the

Illinois General Assembly and personally signed up every legislator on our driver's license on the back.

Illinois is one of the few States with an organ/tissue donor registry. In Illinois, this registry makes use of the existing driver's license and ID card database to identify individuals who are willing to be organ or tissue donors after death. Since October 1992, everyone applying for or renewing an Illinois driver's license or identification card is asked if they want to participate in this registry.

The response has been terrific. Approximately 3 million Illinoisans have joined the registry and nearly 100,000 more enroll each month. The average participation rate statewide is 38 percent compared to a national average of 13 percent, and some counties have reported participation rates of over 70 percent.

The bottom line is when we make it easier for individuals to become organ donors, more people will become donors. H.R. 457 is an important step towards making it easier for Federal employees to be organ donors, and I hope we will see the same kind of response with Federal employees that we have seen in Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to support H.R. 457.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for her kind comments, and certainly I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), for making sure that we moved in a bipartisan effort to bring this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced already 457, the Organ Donor Leave Act, because it supports Federal employees who make the lifesaving decision to become living organ or bone marrow donors by granting them additional leave time to recover from making the donation.

In the last 20 years, important medical breakthroughs have allowed for a larger number of successful organ and tissue transplants and a longer survival rate for transplant recipients. In many cases, transplantation is the only hope for thousands of people suffering from organ failure or in desperate need of corneas, skin, bone, or other tissue.

Despite the success rate of organ transplants, the need for donated organs and tissues continues to outpace the supply. Currently, however, 60,000 Americans are waiting for life-saving transplants. Tragically, every day 12 people die while waiting for a transplant. Every 16 minutes another name is added to the waiting list. This is a

solvable problem and the Federal Government and its employees can help.

In December of 1997, Vice President AL GORE and Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala launched a national organ and tissue donation initiative. In 1998, after the first full year of the initiative, organ donations increased 5.6 percent, the first substantial increase since 1995. During 1998, HHS issued a new regulation to ensure that hospitals worked collaboratively with organ procurement organizations in identifying potential donors and approaching their families.

HHS has conducted a national conference aimed at identifying the most effective strategies to increase donation and transplantation. In conjunction with dozens of partner organizations in the private and volunteer sectors, HHS has worked to increase the awareness of the need for organ and tissue donation.

Recognizing that Federal employees also have a role to play, I first introduced the Organ Donor Leave Act last year. The bill passed the House, but the Senate failed to take action before adjournment. This session, Senator AKAKA introduced companion legislation in the Senate, S. 1334. I am not only pleased that he did so but that his bill is cosponsored by Senator FRIST, one of the Nation's leading transplant surgeons, and the only active surgeon serving in the Congress.

□ 1445

The Organ Donor Leave Act is supported by the American Society of Transplantation, the largest professional transplant organization in the United States.

In a letter expressing their support for the bill, the AST stated that "a lack of leave time has served as a significant impediment and disincentive for individuals willing to share the gift of life."

Currently, Federal employees may use up to 7 days of leave in each calendar year to serve as an organ or bone marrow donor. Yet, experience has shown that an organ transplant operation and postoperative recovery for living donors may take as long as 6 to 8 weeks.

In order to address this disparity, I worked with the Office of Personnel Management and the Department of Health and Human Services in drafting this legislation to increase the amount of leave that may be used for organ donation to 30 days.

The amount of leave that may be used for bone marrow donation will remain at 7 days because that is generally viewed to be adequate.

Under this legislation, donors will not have to be concerned with using their personal sick or annual leave for these vital medical procedures because the leave granted is in addition to what they routinely earn.

Ultimately, this bill will benefit the 62,000 people who are on the organ transplant waiting list.

I urge all Members to give their support to this very, very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments that is often made about transplantation is that there are two types. One is where, of course, a person dies and their organs are used. And the other is where the person is still living.

A lot of people wonder why is it so important that organs be transplanted from living people. I mean, do not get me wrong, those who have died are very important also. But the living are very important because of the following reasons.

The time shown from harvesting of an organ until the time of transplantation is as follows: If a person dies and it is a heart transplantation, it would be 4 to 6 hours; heart and lung 4 to 6 hours; lung 4 to 6 hours; pancreas 8 to 16 hours; a liver 12 to 24 hours; kidney 24 to 36 hours. And so, therefore, when the person is living, doctors have a lot more time to plan and to carry out the procedure.

So often what has happened is many people have donated their organs, but by the time doctors find out after death, they simply do not have enough time to work within the parameters that I just spoke of.

Finally, let me just say this. While we are talking here about the organ donations from those who are living, there is a very fitting quote that comes from Stephanie Kristine Crosse of the University of Dayton School of Law where she talked about organ donation. Although this talks about donations of the dead, I think that it still says a lot for donations.

She says, "The day will come when my body will lie upon a white sheet, neatly tucked under four corners of a mattress, located in a hospital busily occupied with the living and the dying. At a certain moment a doctor will determine that my brain has ceased to function and that, for all intents and purposes, my life has stopped."

"When that happens, do not attempt to instill artificial life into my body by use of a machine. And don't call this my deathbed. Let it be called the bed of life, and let my body be taken from it to help others lead fuller lives."

"Give my sight to the man who has never seen a sunrise, a baby's face, or love in the eyes of a woman. Give my heart to a person whose own heart has caused nothing but endless days of pain. Give my blood to the teenager who was pulled from the wreckage of his car so that he might live to see his grandchildren play. Give my kidneys to one who depends on a machine to exist from week to week."

"Take my bones, every muscle, every fiber, and every nerve in my body and find a way to make a crippled child

walk. Explore every corner of my brain. Take my cells if necessary, and let them grow so that, some day, a deaf girl will hear the sound of rain against her window. Burn what is left and scatter the ashes in the winds to help the flowers grow. If you must bury something, let it be my fault, my weaknesses and all the prejudices against my fellow man."

"Give my sins to the devil. Give my soul to God. If by chance you wish to remember me, do it with a kind deed or word to someone who needs you. If you do all I have asked, I will live forever. "Make a miracle, be an organ donor."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for introducing this legislation and working to bring this bill to the floor.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, for his strong support; the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member who deserve our thanks for expediting House consideration of H.R. 457.

The Organ Donor leave Act is an important step forward in making the Federal Government a leader by example and encouraging our citizens to become organ or bone marrow donors.

I urge all Members to vote for 457 and make it easier for Federal employees to help save a life through organ donation. The Congressional Budget Office has determined that this bill will not have a significant impact on the Federal budget.

I urge all Members to strongly support H.R. 457.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 457, the "Organ Donor Leave Act." This legislation will assure that federal employees will be granted an adequate amount of leave if they choose to undertake organ or bone marrow donation.

Over 50,000 people are currently awaiting an organ transplant, but because of a national shortage, over 4,000 people die each year for lack of a suitable organ. Research points to a clear need for incentive programs and public education concerning organ donation. We need to use every possible option to increase the number of donated organs. This legislation is one way to meet this goal.

Currently, federal employees may use up to 7 days of leave to serve as an organ or bone marrow donor. However, experience indicates the need for additional time for organ transplant operation and postoperative recovery for living donors—up to six or eight weeks in many cases. The "Organ Donor Leave Act" increases the amount of leave that federal employees may use to serve as an organ donor to 30 days.

This legislation also goes hand-in-hand with the "Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act of

1999" which Senator FRIST and I introduced this past March. This non-controversial, non-partisan legislation creates a commemorative medal to honor organ donors and their survivors. I ask that our colleagues act to support both the Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act as well as the Organ Donor Leave Act to increase organ donation and to bring an end to transplant waiting lists.

Today's vote is an important step toward increasing organ donation, but there are many additional steps that we should also be making to improve our national organ donation rate. I look forward to working with my colleagues in implementing additional future improvements.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, organ donation falls into the category of things you never think will affect you or your family—it happens to "other people." Well, let me tell you—I lost that false sense of security a few years ago.

My husband, John, spent three awful, debilitating years on dialysis—three years hoping that his name would come up on the waiting list—before finally receiving a kidney.

He was one of the lucky ones. This gift not only gave John a new lease on life, but it has also given my children back a father, and me, a loving husband.

Mr. Speaker, John is not alone. Every year, thousands of Americans wait anxiously on the organ donation lists, and they are entirely dependent on those kind enough to give. They are entirely dependent on those aware that there is a genuine need.

In simple terms, this is a supply and demand problem—a problem which is turning into a health care crisis:

The disparity between the supply and demand of organs contributes to the deaths of eleven people daily.

Between 1988 and 1996, the number of people on the organ transplant waiting list increased by 312 percent and the number of wait list deaths increased 261 percent.

Additionally, in 1996, a new name was added to the transplant waiting list every nine minutes.

I applaud Representatives CUMMINGS for taking a lead in narrowing this gap.

Living organ donation is the wave of the future, and increasing the frequency of living organ donation will not only increase the availability of organs, but also lessen the transplantation rejection rate and reduce costs associated with dialysis.

Now that we have taken this important leap forward, it is my hope that Congress can take a step further and provide living organ donation leave time for all employees under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

We could also increase donation by reimbursing donors for the costs associated with their donation which are currently not reimbursable by Medicare. For example, travel, lodging, meals and child care.

I have introduced legislation to do just this. H.R. 1857 would (1) expand the F.M.L.A. to include living organ donation and (2) establish a grant program to assist organ donors with the high costs associated with transplantation.

Mr. Speaker, we need a concerted and well-established policy on living organ donation in this country. And I would like to thank representative CUMMINGS for his leadership in moving the Congress forward in this endeavor. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Thank you.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 457.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIGITAL COPYRIGHT LAW TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1260) to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1260

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PERFORMANCES AND DISPLAYS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS.—Section 110(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "(A) a direct charge" and inserting "(i) a direct charge"; and

(2) by striking "(B) the transmission" and inserting "(ii) the transmission".

(b) EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS.—Section 112(e) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking "(2)" and inserting "(1)";

(3) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "(3)" and inserting "(2)";

(B) by striking "(4)" and inserting "(3)";

(C) by striking "(6)" and inserting "(5)"; and

(D) by striking "(3) and (4)" and inserting "(2) and (3)"; and

(4) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "(4)" each place it appears and inserting "(3)"; and

(B) by striking "(5)" each place it appears and inserting "(4)".

(c) DETERMINATION OF REASONABLE LICENSE FEES FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPRIETORS.—Chapter 5 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating the section 512 entitled "**Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors**" as section 513 and placing such section after the section 512 entitled "**Limitations on liability relating to material online**"; and

(2) in the table of sections at the beginning of that chapter by striking

"512. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors."

and inserting

"513. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors."

and placing that item after the item entitled "512. Limitations on liability relating to material online."

(d) ONLINE COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT LIABILITY.—Section 512 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending the caption to read as follows:

"(e) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "INJUNCTIONS.—"; and

(2) in paragraph (3) of subsection (j), by amending the caption to read as follows:

"(3) NOTICE AND EX PARTE ORDERS.—";

(e) INTEGRITY OF COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—Section 1202(e)(2)(B) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking "category or works" and inserting "category of works".

(f) PROTECTION OF DESIGNS.—(1) Section 1302(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking "1 year" and inserting "2 years".

(2) Section 1320(c) of title 17, United States Code, is amended in the subsection caption by striking "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" and inserting "ACKNOWLEDGMENT".

(g) MISCELLANEOUS CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 101 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by transferring and inserting the definition of "United States work" after the definition of "United States"; and

(B) in the definition of "proprietor", by striking "A 'proprietor'" and inserting "For purposes of section 513, a 'proprietor'".

(2) Section 106 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking "120" and inserting "121".

(3) Section 118(e) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "subsection (b)." and all that follows through "Owners" and inserting "subsection (b). Owners"; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(4) Section 119(a)(8)(C)(ii) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking "network's station" and inserting "network station's".

(5) Section 501(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking "118" and inserting "121".

(6) Section 511(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking "119" and inserting "121".

SEC. 2. OTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C.—The section heading for section 1400 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1400. Patents and copyrights, mask works, and designs".

(b) ELIMINATION OF CONFLICTING PROVISION.—Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce."

(c) CLERICAL CORRECTION TO TITLE 35, U.S.C.—Section 3(d) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking ", United States Code".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 1260.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1260, a bill to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

This bill is nearly the same as H.R. 1189, a bill to make technical corrections to title 17, United States Code, and other laws, which passed the House under suspension of the rules on April 13, 1999. This legislation makes significant and necessary improvements to the Copyright Act.

The Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property and the Committee on the Judiciary support S. 1260 in a bipartisan way. I urge its adoption today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the subcommittee, is delayed and asked me to stand in for him, which I am glad to do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1260, a bill making technical corrections in title 17 of the Copyright Act. If ever a bill were truly technical, this is it.

The House Committee on the Judiciary labored long, hard, and successfully last Congress to reduce landmark legislation in the copyright area. This past spring we brought to the House floor H.R. 1189, making a number of technical corrections to the copyright code. As we noted then, the brevity of that bill was testimony to a job well done by all concerned in our efforts last Congress.

Subsequent to passage in this body of H.R. 1189, a small number of additional glitches were identified by our staffs and the staff of the Copyright Office. S. 1260 differs from our House-passed bill for the simple reason that it makes several additional and necessary technical corrections.

I commend the bill to my colleagues and urge its passage. I commend this technical corrections bill to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) mentioned, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) is not able to be with us today. But the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member, has worked very closely with me on this bill. He concurs, and I appreciate the effort that he has given.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1260.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADEMARK AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1999

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1259) to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 relating to dilution of famous marks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1259

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Trademark Amendments Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. DILUTION AS A GROUNDS FOR OPPOSITION AND CANCELATION.

(a) REGISTRABLE MARKS.—Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes" (in this Act referred to as the "Trademark Act of 1946") (15 U.S.C. 1052) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentences: "A mark which when used would cause dilution under section 43(c) may be refused registration only pursuant to a proceeding brought under section 13. A registration for a mark which when used would cause dilution under section 43(c) may be canceled pursuant to a proceeding brought under either section 14 or section 24."

(b) OPPOSITION.—Section 13(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1063(a)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting "including as a result of dilution under section 43(c)," after "principal register".

(c) PETITIONS TO CANCEL REGISTRATIONS.—Section 14 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1064) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting "including as a result of dilution under section 43(c)," after "damaged".

(d) CANCELLATION.—Section 24 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1092) is amended in the second sentence by inserting "including as a result of dilution under section 43(c)," after "register".

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply only to any application for registration filed on or after January 16, 1996.

SEC. 3. REMEDIES IN CASES OF DILUTION OF FAMOUS MARKS.

(a) INJUNCTIONS.—(1) Section 34(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "section 43(a)" and inserting "subsection (a) or (c) of section 43".

(2) Section 43(c)(2) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125(c)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting "as set forth in section 34" after "relief".

(b) DAMAGES.—Section 35(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "or a violation under section 43(a)," and inserting "a violation under section 43(a), or a willful violation under section 43(c)."

(c) DESTRUCTION OF ARTICLES.—Section 36 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1118) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking "or a violation under section 43(a)," and inserting "a violation under

section 43(a), or a willful violation under section 43(c)."; and

(2) by inserting after "in the case of a violation of section 43(a)" the following: "or a willful violation under section 43(c)".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall not apply to any civil action pending on such date of enactment.

SEC. 4. LIABILITY OF GOVERNMENTS FOR TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT AND DILUTION.

(a) CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 32 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1114) is amended in the last undesignated paragraph in paragraph (1)—

(1) in the first sentence by inserting after "includes" the following: "the United States, all agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and all individuals, firms, corporations, or other persons acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, and"; and

(2) in the second sentence by striking "Any" and inserting "The United States, all agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and all individuals, firms, corporations, other persons acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, and any".

(b) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—Section 40 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1122) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(2) by striking "SEC. 40. (a) Any State" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 40. (a) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY BY THE UNITED STATES.—The United States, all agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and all individuals, firms, corporations, other persons acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, shall not be immune from suit in Federal or State court by any person, including any governmental or nongovernmental entity, for any violation under this Act.

(b) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY BY STATES.—Any State"; and

(3) in the first sentence of subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "subsection (a) for a violation described in that subsection" and inserting "subsection (a) or (b) for a violation described therein"; and

(B) by inserting after "other than" the following: "the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any individual, firm, corporation, or other person acting for the United States and with authorization and consent of the United States, or".

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 45 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1127) is amended by inserting between the 2 paragraphs relating to the definition of "person" the following:

"The term 'person' also includes the United States, any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any individual, firm, or corporation acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States. The United States, any agency or instrumentality thereof, and any individual, firm, or corporation acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, shall be subject to the provisions of this Act in the same manner and to the same extent as any nongovernmental entity."

SEC. 5. CIVIL ACTIONS FOR TRADE DRESS INFRINGEMENT.

Section 43(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) In a civil action for trade dress infringement under this Act for trade dress not

registered on the principal register, the person who asserts trade dress protection has the burden of proving that the matter sought to be protected is not functional.”.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) ASSIGNMENT OF MARKS.—Section 10 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1060) is amended—

(1) by striking “subsequent purchase” in the second to last sentence and inserting “assignment”;

(2) in the first sentence by striking “mark,” and inserting “mark.”; and

(3) in the third sentence by striking the second period at the end.

(b) ADDITIONAL CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The text and title of the Trademark Act of 1946 are amended by striking “trade-marks” each place it appears and inserting “trade-marks”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 1259.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of S. 1259, the Trademark Amendments Act of 1999, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

This bill is nearly identical to H.R. 1565, the Trademark Amendments Act of 1999, which the House Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported on May 26 of this year.

This legislation makes significant and necessary improvements in the trademark law.

The Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property and the Committee on the Judiciary support S. 1259 in a bipartisan manner. I urge its adoption today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1259, the Senate trademark bill that is substantially similar to the bill reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary earlier this year, H.R. 1565.

This legislation is a necessary follow-up to the Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995, which was enacted last Congress and which gave a Federal cause of action to holders of famous trademarks for dilution.

The bill before us today is necessary to clear up certain issues in the interpretation of the dilution act which the Federal courts have grappled with since its enactment.

In particular, S. 1259 would provide holders of famous marks with a right to oppose or seek cancellation of a

mark that would cause dilution as provided in the dilution act.

The legislation enacted in the 105th Congress authorizes injunctive relief after the harm has occurred, while the legislation before us today will allow the right to oppose or seek cancellation of a mark hopefully before harm has occurred.

While we today take up the Senate bill, it is substantially the same as the House bill on which a hearing and committee markup occurred earlier this year.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 1259.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1259.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENT FEE INTEGRITY AND INNOVATION PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1258) to authorize funds for the payment of salaries and expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1258

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Patent Fee Integrity and Innovation Protection Act of 1999”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be made available for the payment of salaries and necessary expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office in fiscal year 2000, \$116,000,000 from fees collected in fiscal year 1999 and such fees as are collected in fiscal year 2000 pursuant to title 35, United States Code, and the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.), except that the Commissioner is not authorized to charge and collect fees to cover the accrued indirect personnel costs associated with post-retirement health and life insurance of officers and employees of the Patent and Trademark Office other than those charged and collected pursuant to title 35, United States Code, and the Trademark Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on October 1, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of S. 1258, the Patent Fee Integrity and Innovation Protection Act, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

This bill is identical to H.R. 1225, the Patent and Trademark Office Reauthorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, which the House Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported on June 9. This legislation is premised on the same policy goal as last year's version, namely, to prevent the diversion of revenue generated by special surcharges from the Patent and Trademark Office. The point of S. 1258 is straightforward and necessary, to allow the agency to keep all the revenue it raises in user fees to benefit American inventors and trademark holders. The Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property and the Committee on the Judiciary support S. 1258 in a bipartisan manner, and I urge its adoption today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority, I am happy to rise in support of S. 1258, a bill to reauthorize the Patent and Trademark Office.

S. 1258, like H.R. 1225, reflects bipartisan opposition to surcharges on patent applications and support for fees that will fully fund the PTO and its obligations to its retirees. The bill explicitly authorizes the use of carryover funds to pay for the expense of the Employees Health Benefits and Life Insurance Funds.

The Patent and Trademark Office is 100 percent funded through application and user fees which all too often in the past have been diverted to other agencies and programs to the detriment of the efficient function of our patent and trademark systems. S. 1258, like Public Law 105-358 from the last Congress, reflects our resolve that this practice be firmly a matter of past history.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Not unlike S. 1260 regarding the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the gentleman from California has also worked very closely with us on this bill and the previous bill and concurs in its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1258.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 258 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1074.

□ 1503

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1074) to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) is unavoidably detained and will be here shortly and asked me to proceed.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. Once again, the Congress is taking the lead in enhancing the accountability of the Federal Government to the American people.

The Regulatory Right-to-Know Act is a bipartisan bill that will allow us to better understand the impact on our economy of Federal regulations and bureaucratic red tape. It requires the Office of Management and Budget to submit an annual accounting report that estimates the costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs.

The importance and timeliness of this legislation cannot be understated. Recent studies estimate the compliance costs of Federal regulations at more than \$700 billion annually. Unfortunately, these costs amount to a hidden tax passed on to hardworking Americans in the form of higher prices, reduced wages, stunted economic growth and decreased technological innovation.

Just think, if we could lower the cost of Federal regulations by just one-seventh of that amount, \$100 billion per

year, it would have the effect of a \$1 trillion tax cut for the American people over 10 years. That is \$200 billion more than the tax cut we fought so hard to pass just last week.

But to lower the costs, we have to know the costs. The Regulatory Right-to-Know Act will provide this valuable information, helping regulators make better, more accountable decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that all regulation is bad, but we ought to know the true cost of these actions so that we can judge how useful they really are.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1074 to begin this important review.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1074, the so-called Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999. This legislation would require the Office of Management and Budget to prepare an extensive annual report on the aggregate costs and benefits of Federal regulations, by agency, by agency program and by program component.

For the past 2 years, Congress has enacted appropriations riders that require OMB to tabulate the costs and benefits of major Federal regulations. Some observers have found this annual cost-benefit report to be helpful. They argue that it shows the health, environmental and other benefits of Federal regulations and how those benefits far outweigh their costs.

For example, the 1998 Report to Congress on the Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulations concluded that those benefits far exceeded the costs by anywhere from \$30 billion to \$3.3 trillion. Well, that is a good report supporting the benefits of these regulations and how they outweigh the costs of the regulations. That is what we want to know.

But other observers have questioned the utility of these annual reports. According to the OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, aggregating costs and benefits of regulations are, they say, of little value to policymakers because they offer little guidance on how to improve the efficiency, effectiveness or soundness of the existing body of regulations. Why? Why would that be the case? They say, because the information available includes enormous data gaps, accurate data is sparse and agreed-upon methods for estimating costs and benefits are lacking.

Furthermore, critics like Professor Lisa Heinzerling of the Georgetown University Law Center say that the difficulty in quantifying benefits is likely to cause skewed results. Comparing aggregate, quantifiable costs, such as the dollar cost to comply with regulations, is easier to do than to quantify the really basically unquantifiable benefits, such as lives saved or a cleaner and healthier environment, and so to compare the two may mislead the public about the net benefits of regulation.

Well, whatever the merits of the current annual report that is being prepared by OMB, this bill is seriously flawed. First of all, this bill does not codify the idea that we will have annual reports. Instead, it dramatically expands these requirements in ways that will substantially increase the burdens on OMB, raise the costs to the taxpayers, and produce little significant new information.

In short, if H.R. 1074 were itself subject to a cost-benefit analysis, it would flunk.

One of the major problems in this bill is its scope. Currently, OMB prepares an annual analysis of the costs and benefits of "major" regulations with an annual economic impact of over \$100 million. This makes some sense. There are relatively few major regulations. Out of the 5,000 regulations issued in the Federal Register each year, only about 50 have major economic effects. The limitation to major regulations allows OMB to focus its analysis on the most important and costly regulations.

Moreover, agencies that promulgate these major regulations have to prepare cost-benefit regulations as part of the rulemaking process, so this gives OMB a database to draw from.

But this bill, H.R. 1074, is not limited to major regulations. It requires a cost-benefit analysis of all 5,000 regulations issued each year. According to this bill, the report must include, quote, an estimate of the total annual costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs, including rules and paperwork; one, in the aggregate; two, by agency, agency program, and program component; and, three, by major rule. This would therefore require agencies to perform cost-benefit analysis for all rules in order to provide OMB with the information it needs to compile the aggregate report.

This simply does not make sense. OMB testified that this bill would require OMB and the agencies to compile detailed data that they do not now have, and undertake analyses that they do not now conduct, using scarce staff and contract resources. That is because there is no such information available for these 5,000 nonmajor rules.

The administration says that the increased burden that this would place on the agencies would crowd out other priorities and would add little value. We have heard similar comments from unions, consumer groups and environmental organizations. Groups opposed to H.R. 1074 include the AFL-CIO, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Public Citizen, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club and dozens of other national and local public interest groups.

Before the committee markup in May, we reviewed the Federal Register to see what types of rules would be subject to this new cost-benefit analysis. One example was a temporary rule issued by the Coast Guard governing the operation of a drawbridge near

Hackberry, Louisiana. This regulation was completely noncontroversial. In fact, it was actually requested by the State in order for the State transportation department to make some necessary repairs. Yet under H.R. 1074, OMB now needs to conduct an analysis of the economic costs and benefits of this regulation, including its direct and indirect effects on economic growth, prices, wages, small business and productivity.

There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of rules issued each year that fall into this category. Is this how we want to spend the taxpayers' dollars?

Not only would this bill be wasteful, it would provide an incomplete picture of the costs and benefits of government programs by omitting corporate welfare from the report of aggregate costs and benefits to the taxpayers. According to an investigation by "Time" magazine, the Federal Government gives out \$125 billion a year in corporate welfare. It seems to me that it is only logical that any OMB report should include all costs and benefits to the economy, including the costs to the taxpayers and benefits to businesses from corporate welfare.

Later today, several of our colleagues will introduce an amendment to address these concerns. The Hoeffel-Kucinich-Visclosky Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare Disclosure Amendment would require OMB to report on the costs and benefits of corporate welfare.

□ 1515

It would also limit the amount of money that could be spent on these analyses to \$1 million, double what the CBO estimated for the annual cost to implement the bill, while we are giving twice as much as CBO says this bill is going to cost, because I do not think their cost estimate is going to be correct.

And there ought to be some ceiling on the amount of money that hard-working taxpayers are going to pay to do this analysis that may not even be of any value. We ought not to be spending certainly more than \$1 million on this project which seems to be the personal agenda of some of those who are pushing the legislation. While this amendment does not address all my concerns with H.R. 1074, it will go a long way towards protecting the taxpayer by limiting the cost of the bill and giving a more accurate picture of the costs and benefits of government programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge at the appropriate time that Members support the amendment. The Hoeffel-Kucinich-Visclosky Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare disclosure amendment is a commonsense amendment that would at least improve a deeply flawed bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, no one in this room would buy a house without hiring an inspector to look it over carefully to make sure it was liveable; no one would buy a new car without looking at the warranty and taking it out for a spin to make sure that it runs; none of us would buy a new suit of clothes without having it professionally tailored and then trying it on first to see if it fits, yet we expect the American people to spend \$700 billion a year to comply with thousands of Federal regulations without knowing whether those regulations do what they are supposed to do.

I think we owe the American people an explanation. H.R. 1074 will help us give them one. It will help us answer the questions about whether all these regulations are worth what we are paying for them and whether society enjoys a net benefit. This bill will improve our regulatory system by putting timely, reliable information on the costs and benefits of regulations in the hands of policymakers and legislators. At the same time, it leaves in place all existing rules and it maintains the integrity of the existing rulemaking process.

Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve to know what they are getting for \$700 billion a year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in support of H.R. 1074. The public has a right to know. What this issue really boils down to is what is good for democracy, and what is always good for democracy is information. What this legislation seeks to achieve is to give the public information.

Now through our regulatory framework in our Executive Branch of government all of our laws in this country are implemented, executed by our Executive Branch of government. We here in Congress often pass overly vague laws, and it is up to the regulators, the Executive Branch of government as defined in the Constitution, to put the teeth in those laws, to execute those laws, to define the regulations.

But what we are finding in this Federal Government which has become very vast and very large with so many different regulations, so many different agencies often promulgating the same regulations on the same topic and the same issue, that we have so much duplication, we have so many regulations that are passed onto our people which really take the full force of law, which do not take into account any chance of looking at whether the costs exceed the benefits, whether there is a better way of imposing the regulation or whether it duplicates other existing regulations within the Federal Government.

What this bill seeks to do is to have OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, conduct a review every year, something well within their means,

something the Congressional Budget Office says is very minimal on a cost basis. What the OMB will do under this law is give us a report analyzing the costs and the benefits of proposed regulations. It will look at whether or not regulations duplicate each other.

We analyzed this last week, and we looked at so many different areas where regulations are so duplicative that people, family farmers, factory workers, small businessmen and women in this country are facing regulations that tear them in different directions. We have two different regulatory agencies pursuing wet lands conservation laws. One regulatory agency told a farmer in California, Dave Peckham, "Go ahead and farm your field, put a vineyard in there. Make sure you put your vineyard around this wetland," and then another agency came and said, "You're violating the law. We're going to conduct fines and impose penalties on your business."

We have so much waste and duplication in our regulatory agencies in this government that the public has a right to know what is being duplicated, where is this taking place. The public also has a right to know about the costs and the benefits of the regulations being placed upon our people. And what this really comes down to is simply a good government act. This is good government.

The U.S. Government imposes a hidden tax on our public today. Last week, we voted for a tax relief package. We imposed taxes, income taxes, excise taxes, inheritance taxes, capital gains taxes, death taxes on our people in an overt way. We see the tax, it comes out of our paycheck, we send in our 1040. But there are other taxes that our public pays today, there are other taxes that citizens of this country pay, and that is a hidden tax, the cost of regulations.

It is estimated by Thomas Hopkins of the University of Rochester, the Rochester Institute of Technology, that hidden tax of regulations costs our economy, our people, our small businesses every year in excess of \$700 billion. A \$700 billion tax is being imposed upon the people of this country, and we are not even looking into whether or not these taxes exceed the costs, whether the benefits of these taxes exceed the costs, whether or not they are being duplicative or not. All this is a good government measure to say: Let us look at what we are doing as a Federal Government, let us look at the regulations we are promulgating.

This does not change one regulation, this does not affect any law from being implemented. This gives the public the right to know the truth. This gives the public the information that they need so they can follow the law.

All we are saying is, "Let's have the Office of Management and Budget review these regulations, let's have the Office of Management and Budget weigh the costs and the benefits of these regulations, let's have the Office

of Management and Budget tell us whether they are overly duplicative or not," and I would like to echo what my colleague from Illinois said about the bill and its supporters:

Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan bill. This bill is being supported by the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislators, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties and the International City and County Management Association. The bill is also supported by Americans for Tax Reform, the Center For The Study of American Business, Citizens for a Sound Economy, the Seniors Coalition and the Sixties Plus Coalition.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

It is very peculiar to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) say we have OMB to do this analysis so we can find out the cost benefit of regulations. Well, OMB already does that, and the gentleman said the OMB said it costs \$700 billion a year to comply with regulations.

That is not accurate. OMB said, after doing their analysis, that it costs \$230 billion not \$700 billion; and that is the costs. But the benefits for regulations OMB said ranged, because we cannot know precisely how to quantify it, but we know there are certain enormous benefits that come from regulations to protect the environment, to protect public health and safety; they say the benefits of a \$230 billion cost is anywhere from \$260 billion in benefits to \$3.5 trillion.

Now the gentleman wants OMB to do a report, but he ought to be accurate in telling the Members what OMB is already saying on this very subject. Let me tell my colleagues what some others are saying about this bill.

The United Auto Workers say the UAW submits that this bill would only serve to further delay the promulgation of public health and safety protections by mandating wasteful analysis and diverting limited agency resources.

The United Steelworkers say that they oppose this bill because it would lengthen and complicate the already cumbersome regulatory process of agencies such as OSHA which address issues affecting worker safety and health.

The Consumers Union opposes this bill, and they say that the substitution of different words or details does not obviate the need this bill would create for the Executive Branch to expend the very substantial resources in an attempt to quantify what they may well find is unquantifiable and most certainly would be meaningless in an aggregate form.

Now do we want to take taxpayers' hard-earned money and waste it, because that is what this bill would do. It would have OMB spend, I believe, without a limit, millions of dollars on an analysis on non-major regulations. We are not talking about major regula-

tions, but regulations that are non-major, often noncontroversial, usually noncontroversial, regulations that everyone supports, and then have to go through a lot of paperwork. Well, maybe it is a win for those who have their own agenda to say that if maybe they are lucky, OMB came out with a report showing that the costs out-did the benefits. They can say, well, there is a wasteful regulation, but even if they can never come up with a way of showing that some of these regulations are not effective, they could just busy all the people in the government doing these reports that serve no useful purpose.

Let us subject this bill to a cost-benefit analysis. We do not know what the full costs will be of this bill to make OMB go through all these regulations and review. But we do know that the costs are going to be extraordinary and the benefits are going to be minuscule. We ought not to enact legislation that does not serve a cost-benefit purpose, we certainly ought not to have regulations that do not have benefits outweighing the costs. And I think that the way to make sure that we have regulations that are effective and cost effective is to do our job as congressional custodians through oversight and not just simply pass laws that can do a great deal of harm.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) for his management.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) assumed the chair.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 1530

REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) has 21½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are bringing this bill, the Regulatory Right-To-Know Act of 1999, which is, as my colleague said, a bipartisan bill to promote the public's right to know the cost benefits and impacts of Federal regulations. This bill is the product of work done by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) over the last several years, and it builds on provisions that were included in the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for 1997, 1998, and 1999. There is also a companion bill in the Senate, S. 59, also designed to establish a permanent and strengthened regulatory accounting system.

Now, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) says this bill would put onerous new requirements on the bureaucracies and the agencies that write regulations. If only there was that sentiment and concern about the small businesses, the farmers, the people who are working to earn a living outside of government about the onerous costs of Federal regulations, because estimates are that they do, indeed, amount to \$700 billion a year. These are private estimates which have measured the cost of these.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1074 is a good government requirement that the Office of Management and Budget would actually make sure that the regulatory impact analyses are done on major rules and that they aggregate these into an annual accounting statement and an associated report. The accounting statement would provide the estimates of the costs and benefits for Federal regulatory programs in the aggregate; not one-by-one as each rule comes through the process, but by agency, so that we can compare where are these costs coming from; which agencies have the greater burden; which agencies provide the greater benefits for us in these social programs, as well as by program within each agency, and by program component.

The information would be provided for the same 7-year time series as the budget of the United States: the current year, 2 preceding years, and the 4 following years.

The associated report would analyze the impacts of Federal rules and paperwork on various sectors; for example, what is the cumulative impact on several different agencies on small businesses or on farmers, and it would also do it by functional areas; what is the impact on public health. That is where I think we will see the greatest analysis of the potential benefits of Federal regulations. Where are our regulatory programs having an impact on the environment, giving us a cleaner environment; where are they having an impact on creating greater health for the public; where are they having an impact on greater safety.

The essential question that I think this analysis and the final report will help us to answer is how do we get the

biggest bang for our buck, for all of the billions of dollars of regulatory costs that we impose upon this country in order to pursue those social goals of a cleaner environment, a healthier workplace, and a healthier lifestyle for all Americans.

One of the things we have noticed in our subcommittee time and time again is that there are many times in which we have overlapping regulations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) spoke of several of those, in which we have duplications, in which we have potential inconsistencies among Federal regulatory programs. The report will offer recommendations to reform those inefficient programs so that we can do a better job. Once again, how do we get the biggest bang for the buck out of all of the costs imposed in Federal regulations.

Currently, there is no report that analyzes these cumulative impacts of Federal regulations. I believe from the bottom of my heart that Americans have a right to know what are those costs, what are those benefits, and what are the impacts they have on various sectors and various functional areas.

Current estimates, as we talked about earlier, are, indeed, in the private sector, could be as much as \$750 billion, which would be, by the way, a 25 percent increase from 10 years ago. Nobody quite knows because the Regulatory Right-to-Know bill has not been enacted; and, therefore, there is no cumulative accounting for the costs of regulations. By the way, if that estimate is correct, that ends up being a little less than \$7,000, about \$6,900 for every family in America, a lot more than the taxes that they pay directly to the Federal Government.

Now, the bill requires OMB to issue guidelines, to standardize agency estimates of costs and benefits and the format for the annual accounting statement. The bill also requires the Office of Management and Budget to quantify the net benefits for each alternative considered, as well as the net costs, so that we can determine whether the agencies are doing their job in maximizing the benefits to the environment, health and safety, and minimizing the costs to the American public.

I think this bill will help the public understand how and why major decisions that are made by the executive branch agencies are made, and it will disclose if there are agencies that have indeed chosen the most effective and least costly approach.

To ensure a balanced and fair estimate in these areas, the bill requires that this annual report be publicized in a draft form and be submitted to with two or more experts for the opportunity of peer review, so that we get outside estimates, outside expertise looking at those questions on the costs and the benefits of regulations. Finally, it requires that the report be published annually, so that everybody,

every citizen can have access to that information.

One of the things that we have also done is we require OMB to compile some new and improved information about regulatory programs, but we also believe that the bill will not impose any significant undue burden on OMB, since much of the needed regulation is either already available or already to be provided to OMB under the President's executive order on regulatory review.

Now, since 1981, when President Reagan issued his historic executive order, the Federal agencies have been required to perform a cost-benefit analysis of major rules, which constitutes the bulk of the Federal regulatory cost and benefits. Also, OMB can use any other sources of information, including private regulatory accounting studies and government studies done by the agencies.

The bill, as reported by the Committee on Government Reform, made many changes to lessen the burden on OMB and to address the administration's concern, including a phase-in of some of these key requirements. The result is that the CBO has estimated the cost of this bill to the taxpayer is less than \$500,000, less than \$500,000 each year. To me and my way of thinking, that is a tremendous benefit when one can spend a little less than \$500,000 and potentially save billions of dollars for the American public on unnecessary, duplicative regulations.

There is also a very small sum of money to tell us where can we get the biggest bang for the buck in terms of improving the health and safety of the American worker, in terms of getting the biggest bang for the buck in cleaning up the environment, in terms of getting the biggest bang for the buck in allowing Americans to live a healthier life. I think the cost of this rule, as demonstrated by the CBO estimate, certainly meets any type of cost-benefit analysis that we might want to impose on it.

This bipartisan bill has been endorsed by many organizations; and my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) started to mention several of the major public organizations, representatives of cities and towns and State governments, as well as the National Governors Association; but it has also been endorsed by the Alliance USA; the American Farm Bureau Federation; the Americans for Tax Reform; the Associated Builders and Contractors and the Business Roundtable; the Center for the Study of American Business; the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America which, by the way, is key voting this bill; the Chemical Manufacturers Association; The Citizens for a Sound Economy, which is also key voting this legislation; the National Association of Manufacturers, which is also key voting the legislation; the National Associations of Towns and Townships; the National Federation of

Independent Businesses; the Seniors Coalition; 60 Plus Association; and the Small Business Survival Community; which is also key voting this piece of legislation.

Now, unfortunately, some of the complaints about this bill, some of those raised in fact in the minority views of the committee report, end up misunderstanding the bill and therefore lead to incorrect or misleading assertions about what is required in the legislation. For example, it incorrectly states that it would require a cost-benefit analysis for every major and minor rule. That is simply not in the legislation.

What the bill does require is that major rules that are currently subject to the executive order have a regulatory impact analysis, but there are no new regulatory impact analyses, no new rule-by-rule cost-benefit analyses, and no new rule-by-rule impact analyses. Simply, what this bill does is require OMB to enforce the executive orders and then aggregate the data by various sectors.

One of the things that we must do in focusing on this is also ask ourselves, will this have an impact on slowing down issuing of regulations. The bill does not change any standard of law; and it cannot, frankly, slow down any rulemaking, because the analyses are required to be done after the fact and in the aggregate. This is a look back to say what are the regulatory programs that were put in place in the past year and what are the costs, so that we can now look and see whether we have the best overall regulatory proposals.

I hope today's debate recognizes both the bipartisan nature and the narrow intent of H.R. 1074 to provide useful information. The public, it does have a right to know where its regulatory agencies are performing and how they are doing; and it will provide useful information to decisionmakers, both in Congress and in the executive branch, about the costs, the relative benefits, the impact of various Federal programs, so that we can do a better job of legislating in those areas, and the executive branch can do a better job of regulating in those areas.

In May and April, at the subcommittee and full committee mark-ups, opponents of the bill tried to add some amendments to cripple the legislation or to undermine the public's ability to actually receive the information about these regulatory programs. There are some amendments on the floor today that would do that. I think it is critical that we move forward to actually ensure that the public does have a right to know about its regulatory process, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose any weakening amendments, any amendments that would gut the bill, any amendments that would be, in fact, undermining the essential goals of this legislation. I believe the public has a right to an open and accountable government. OMB's accounting statement and a report

that this legislation will require, will provide important tools to help Americans participate more fully in government decision-making, and to assist in making smarter regulatory decisions for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the gentleman from Indiana is absolutely incorrect when he tells us that his bill would apply to just the major rules, because the text of his bill provides that there would be all the rules and paperwork in the aggregate, by agency, agency program and program component, and by major rule. If he wanted it by "major rule" alone, he could have said that.

Further, on the bill it says, "analysis of the impacts of Federal rules and paperwork on Federal, State," so on and so forth. It does not say "major," it says "impacts of Federal rules." The consequence of that would be, I believe, to waste an enormous amount of money.

There is an argument to do a cost-benefit analysis, as has been required in the appropriations riders, on the major rules. But when we get into these minor rules, we are talking about things like noncontroversial requests to have a regulation of a drawbridge near Hackberry, Louisiana, that everybody supported, and then one would have to go through all the paperwork to do an analysis on a noncontroversial rule.

On May 14, the Veterans' Administration issued a rule to adjust the level of education assistance available to veterans as required by the Benefits Act for Veterans of 1998. This rule was strictly ministerial, since the adjustment was required by statute. That rule would have to be subject to an extensive analysis with a lot of paperwork, with even peer reviewers to look at OMB's analysis after the fact.

On July 23, the Department of the Treasury issued a rule to allow the U.S. Mint to use mechanical means rather than melting to destroy mutilated coins. Well, we would have to have that rule reviewed over again to try to quantify the costs and the benefits of taking these mutilated coins and melting them down as opposed to using some other way to destroy them.

On July 23, the Food and Drug Administration amended its animal drug regulations to reflect the approval of a new drug to treat infections in dogs. Well, why should that have to go through a long, extensive review of the costs and benefits?

Now, it is not just the costs and benefits of that regulation, in and of itself; but it is costs and benefits to the economy, to wages, to productivity and growth. So we are, in effect, mandating an enormous amount of burden, a lot of busywork, wasting taxpayers' dollars to comply with this legislation that is so overly broad in the way it has been drafted.

Now, there may be groups that support it because they were misinformed, as are the Members being misinformed today about the legislation. They may think it was only the major rules, but in fact, it goes far beyond that.

Mr. Chairman, could I just inquire as to the amount of time on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has 13 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) has 10 minutes remaining.

□ 1545

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, my concern about H.R. 1074 is that it would give us an incomplete picture. The proponents of this bill, of the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act, are asking for a cost-benefit analysis of Federal regulations, arguing that the public and Congress have a right to know the cost of the regulations that are promulgated by the bureaucracy in response to the statutes that we pass here in Congress.

Frankly, it is a fair request. It is a rational request. I understand why they want to know that. They say it may cost \$700 million a year. They cite private estimates that may or may not be true. It could be far, far less than that, as government studies have indicated. However, we do have some reason to want to know the cost of government regulation.

But the bill before us would give an incomplete picture. There is no question that government regulations cost money. They cost businesses money to comply. That is obvious on the face. In return, we hope we get certain benefits: a safer workplace, a more competitive business environment, better consumer protections, cleaner environmental sites, cleaner air, cleaner water. There is certainly a benefit intended when we pass a bill that is turned into a regulation that in turn regulates business.

But if we are really interested in finding out the impact on businesses of Federal action, we must not only do a cost-benefit analysis of regulations, but we must include in that a cost-benefit analysis of the corporate welfare received by many of those businesses.

"Corporate welfare" is a term bandied about a lot. It can mean a number of different things. It is outright government spending subsidies to certain businesses that give them a direct benefit from the taxpayer. Corporate welfare includes tax preferences, tax breaks, loan guarantees, and loan preferences.

Corporate welfare includes the use of government assets below market value. Grazing on government lands, mining on government lands, logging on government land at rates below fair market value, all of that comprises corporate welfare.

If we are serious about analyzing the cost of government action on American business, and if we really want to give the American people the full picture, we have to ask for the full picture. If we are going to ask the Office of Management and Budget to do an analysis of the cost and benefit of Federal regulations, we have to include in that analysis the costs and benefits of corporate welfare that have been estimated by Time Magazine at \$125 billion a year.

I will have more to say about the corporate welfare aspect of this debate when I offer an amendment on that subject in a few minutes. I rise now simply to urge the House to understand the full picture and to ask for the full picture.

What do the proponents of the bill have to hide? If we want to know the impact on business of Federal actions through regulations, let us include in that study the impact on business of the benefits given through corporate welfare.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

As I mentioned, the gentleman is the originator of this legislation, and much credit goes to him for his diligent work in this area over the last several years.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have worked with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and a broad bipartisan group of cosponsors on the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999.

The bill was introduced with 17 Democrats and 14 Republicans as cosponsors. The bill has been improved in committee to address some of the concerns of the Office of Management and Budget, and based on two amendments by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) to add new information requirements and to ensure a balanced and peer review.

One of the amendments of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) requires an analysis of the impacts of programs and program components on public health, public safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals.

Moreover, the definition of both benefits and costs include quantifiable and nonquantifiable effects, including social, health, safety, environmental, and economic effects. I think Members can see that we have gone the extra mile to ensure that this legislation encompasses a fair analysis and is not weighted just toward regulatory costs.

I should also note that the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999 changes no regulatory standard and will not slow down the development of

any regulation. Moreover, the Congressional Budget Office has scored this bill in its lowest category as costing under \$500,000 per year.

The Regulatory Right-to-Know Act is a basic step towards a smarter partnership in regulatory programs. It is an important tool to understand the magnitude and impact of Federal regulatory programs. The act will empower all Americans, including State and local officials, with new information and opportunities to help them participate more fully and improve our government. More useful information and public input will help regulators make better, more accountable decisions and promote greater confidence in the quality of Federal policy and regulatory decisions.

Better decisions and updated regulatory programs will enhance innovation, improve the quality of our environment, secure our economic future, and give a better quality of life to every American.

Mr. Chairman, while good management and accountability matter, there are a number of reasons that this act is the right step towards enhanced quality and accountability in regulatory programs. Over the past 4 years, this Congress has changed the direction of the Federal Government from the endless burden of more taxes and spending to the new fiscal discipline of balance and accountability.

For the past decade, America's business ingenuity accounts for a surge in quality and productivity. The result of this surge is an American economy which is the unparalleled envy of the world. Millions of Americans in private businesses have brought incredible improvements to our quality of life, health care, and education.

Through the new emphasis on flexibility and innovation, State and local officials have led the way to safer, cleaner, and more prosperous places to live. Given this power and responsibility, we in Congress must be the allies of state and local government, American business and families, through responsible management of the Nation's regulatory programs to ensure quality in necessary regulation and freedom from unwise regulation.

The drive for quality, the same basic drive toward the free market and State and local innovation, must be the drive for Federal regulatory programs as we enter the next millennium.

This may take time. We have already reviewed two accounting reports from the Office of Management and Budget. Many parties commented on drafts of these documents and have pointed out the need for substantial improvement. I expect the real impact from this information will be a few years from now, when the information base is built up further.

The concept of flexibility and improvement for the accounting statement itself is built into the legislation. I agree with the Office of Management and Budget, that the current informa-

tion is not sufficiently detailed to make management decisions. That is a few years down the road. We should not, however, accept a path where ignorance is bliss. We also agree with the Office of Management and Budget in its last accounting statement report when it said, "This report presents new information on both the total costs and benefits of regulations and the costs and benefits of major individual regulations. We hope to continue this important dialogue to improve our knowledge about the effects of regulation on the public, the economy, and American society."

In closing, this bill will provide vital information to Congress and the executive branch so they may fulfill their obligation to ensure wise expenditure of limited national economic resources and improve our regulatory system. Let us not forget that a tax or a consumer dollar spent on a wasteful program is a dollar that cannot be spent on teachers, police officers, or health care.

If we are serious about openness, the public's right to know, accountability, and fulfilling our responsibilities as managers, we will enact this important piece of legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration, which would have to enforce this proposal, has written that they oppose it. They say, "The increased burden that this would place on the agencies would crowd out other priorities and would add little value in many cases. That is because cost-benefit analysis can be very expensive and time-consuming."

The Environmental Defense Fund, which opposes this legislation, said that, "The bill ignores the serious practical and methodological limitations that characterize cost-benefit analysis. In doing so, it compels agencies to waste considerable taxpayers' resources developing new information that is worse than useless."

The Environmental Coalition of Mississippi said, "This legislation would impose burdens on Federal agencies, undermining their ability to protect consumers' civil rights, public health, safety, and the environment."

The Natural Resources Defense Council said, "We strongly believe this legislation would create needless bureaucracy and divert scarce agency resources away from the efforts to carry out and enforce vital public health and environmental safeguards."

Of course, I mentioned in my opening comments all the other environmental, public health, public interest groups that oppose this legislation. The main reason that I would urge Members to oppose it is that it is not what it has been represented to be. It is not a review of the major regulations. It covers all regulations. It wastes taxpayers' dollars in doing so.

To me, to waste taxpayers' dollars in the name of trying to save taxpayers'

money is a fraud on the American people. This legislation is well-intended but poorly drafted, and for that reason, I would hope that when we get to final passage of the legislation, Members would vote against it.

For a proposed regulation to be promulgated by an agency, it has to be reviewed and subject to comments from anybody affected. After that, it goes to the Office of Management and Budget, where they are required by law to review it and to do a cost-benefit analysis on it before it is considered one that will be put into final form. After that, once the regulation becomes legally binding, existing riders on appropriations say that if it is major, we ought to review it for cost-benefit to see whether we are getting the benefits for the costs.

This bill goes beyond all of that and requires that small, non-controversial regulations be subject to this wasteful exercise for no value after we have got all that paperwork that will be generated by the legislation. So I would hope that Members would oppose the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1074. Before coming to Congress, I spent 8 years as a Member of the Omaha Nebraska City Council. This gave me an opportunity to observe firsthand the impact of Federal regulations on our cities.

Many of the regulations may not cost the Federal Government much, but the cost to the States and the localities can often be great. Washington regulators need to appreciate how much of a financial burden their rules are on other forms of government. They might even be encouraged to find more cost-effective ways of accomplishing their goals.

This is why this legislation is so necessary. Let me tell the Members, just to build a road within the city of Omaha, some firsthand experience. About 30 to 40 percent of the time and talent to get that road built is spent in trying to comply with Federal rules and regulations. It is very costly. The irony here is that some of those Federal regulations that we must comply with at the local level to try and build that road demand cost-benefit analysis.

I would say what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Perhaps some of those rules and regulations are not necessary, and we could streamline and create efficiencies and cost savings at the local level.

Information on the costs and the benefits of the Federal regulatory programs has been available since 1997. The existing legislation before us today strengthens the existing requirements and makes them permanent law.

From the City Council service, I can appreciate why all the major organizations representing State and local

elected officials support the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act. As a sponsor of H.R. 1074, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting it, and oppose the Hoeffel amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have had these kinds of debates in the past on so-called regulatory reform proposals, and what we usually get in the course of these debates are a lot of anecdotes. They are the kinds of anecdotes that get all of us very angry. It usually involves some well-meaning citizen who is the victim of some terrible regulation, or an overzealous agency.

□ 1600

After we hear these gut-wrenching stories, we are asked to conclude that the regulatory system is broken and needs to be reformed. The only problem with these stories is that they are just that, stories. After the debate, we go back and research some of these anecdotes, as we have done in the past, and they may include a kernel of truth, but the facts and conclusions end up being wrong.

For example, in the 104th Congress, we were told about the Safe Drinking Water Act requiring the City of Columbus to test its drinking water for pesticide used only to grow pineapples. That, of course, is ridiculous. Everyone knows one does not grow pineapples in Columbus, Ohio. But when we looked into that story, which was told on the House floor, it turned out that the pesticide DBCP is considered a probable human carcinogen, and it was widely used on over 40 crops until it was banned in 1979. Since then, it was found in the groundwater in 24 States, and 19 States have reported levels above the Federal standard.

I remember also hearing from the gentleman from Indiana about OSHA killing the tooth fairy by requiring extracted baby teeth be disposed of as hazardous waste rather than allowing the parents to take the teeth home. Well, that sounds ridiculous. But when we checked it out, it turned out there was a regulation issued by the Bush administration that required dental workers to take precautions when handling extracted teeth because they were contaminated with blood. But a gloved dentist was allowed to put the tooth in a clean container and give the tooth to the parents for the tooth fairy.

There are other examples. But now, during the debate on this bill, we heard a new anecdote. Last Thursday, when we were debating the rule for this bill, and I believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) repeated this, we heard the story in the debate today of Dave Pechan who got caught in a turf fight over wetlands regulations between the National Resources Conservation Service and the Army Corps of Engineers.

According to our colleague, the Conservation Service gave Mr. Pechan ap-

proval to convert his land into a vineyard, but then the Army Corps of Engineers told them he will be subjected to civil and criminal penalties if he continues to work his land. He is now in limbo while the Corps conducts its own wetlands evaluation of his property. That is a quote from our colleague.

Well, we called the Army Corps of Engineers on Friday. What we found out is that, while the Corps disagreed with the Conservation Service's wetlands determination, it deferred to their decision. The Corps sent a letter to Mr. Pechan in December of 1997 informing him that their investigation was effectively closed. So Mr. Pechan is not being subjected to civil or criminal penalties, and he is not in limbo.

Mr. Chairman, we may disagree on the role of the Federal Government or the need for Federal regulations to protect health, safety, and the environment; but we ought to keep the debate on the facts.

The facts are this bill is not as has been represented, only dealing with major regulations. It applies to all regulations. The facts are this bill will cost a lot of money. We have heard cited the CBO's estimate of \$500,000, but I believe it is going to be more. We will see, if it is only \$500,000, whether the other side will agree to an amendment that will say, okay, no more than a million dollars can be spent on this enterprise.

I would like to submit for the RECORD, and I am going to with this statement, comparisons of other anecdotes and facts that we found for the various cases that have been raised on the House floor. Let us not let these anecdotes, which make all of us angry if we thought they were true, be used to get us to make policy changes in our law that will, as some of the groups that are opposed to this legislation indicated, provide for excessive waste of taxpayers' dollars, to develop a needless bureaucracy, divert scarce agency resources away from the efforts to carry out and enforce vital public health and environmental safeguards.

I would urge opposition to this legislation.

With these comments, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, if love and communication are the seeds of a good marriage, then open discussions are a good thing. It is this same principle that highlights the importance of the Regulatory Right-To-Know Act and why it must be approved. The more we know about the burdens of Federal regulations imposed on American families, the better our decisions will be.

This bill gives policymakers, lawmakers, regulators, and the public a valuable tool for evaluating the benefits and burdens that new regulations

impose. Either way, it provides an honest and open accounting of our votes.

This effort is bipartisan, and it is built on the principles of openness and accountability. The public has the right to know its government has considered every factor when it imposes new regulations on Americans. To do anything less would be irresponsible.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Regulatory Right-To-Know Act.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to, rather than go into anecdotes, go into facts and talk about some of the arrangements that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has been talking about.

First, I would like to talk about the score of the bill. The Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, said that this would cost less than \$500,000 per year for this score of the bill. That is after they read the legislation, and I will get to that in 1 second.

But to put this in perspective, Federal agencies will spend an estimated \$17.9 billion per year to write and enforce regulations in fiscal year 1999. That is one-tenth of 1 percent of total spending on Federal regulatory programs.

Even if we assume for the sake of argument that the CBO's estimate is off by a factor of 10, H.R. 1074 would still cost less than 1 percent of total agency spending on regulations. It will not strain agencies' budgets.

But going on to the point that this would cause a cost-benefit analysis on rule by rule by rule, the bill specifically states that OMB is given the discretion to bundle rules into aggregate components, to take a look at component rule categories.

So this will not make OMB go down the road of doing 5,000 separate rule by rule by rule cost-benefit analyses. This bill gives OMB the discretion to bundle rules in the aggregate by section, by related categories, and then conduct the aggregate cost-benefit analyses.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This piece of legislation would require the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to report on the aggregate annual cost and benefit of regulations, regulatory programs, and program components. Unfortunately, bill would waste taxpayer dollars by compelling agencies to use their limited resources to annually analyze rules that are immaterial. The resulting information likely would not improve the efficiency, effectiveness, or soundness of the existing body of regulations.

The OMB traditionally has worked hard to annually report on the costs and benefits of approximately 50 major rules. This bill, as it stands, would require the OMB to report on the costs and benefits on over 5,000 rules issued each year. This would include thousands of administrative and routine rules that OMB currently does not review.

This bill also fails to disclose to the public the costs and benefits of billions of dollars of

corporate welfare doled out by the federal government to regulated corporations each year.

The burden imposed by this bill will fall on agencies and prevent them from using valuable funds for environmental and health programs. It will tie up agencies with new, unnecessary, bureaucratic red tape that will keep our agency workers writing reports instead of helping people.

Many citizen groups oppose this bill, because they see the danger in keeping our agencies overburdened with administrative requirements, rather than allowing them to make new rules, and enforce existing regulations. Some of the groups that oppose this bill include the Sierra Club, the League of Conservation Voters, the Defenders of Wildlife, the Environmental Defense Fund, the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, the United Steelworkers of America, the Consumers Union and the American Lung Association. Each of these diverse groups knows that administrative agencies are there to help them in their causes—saving the environment, protecting American workers' jobs, and preserving and improving our health—and do not want to see these agencies face additional hurdles when trying to fulfill their purpose.

These studies required under this bill are impractical and unworkable. Simply said, in many cases, agency workers will not be able to quantify, especially in a fiscal sense, what good a regulation can do. How can we put a price on preserving our beautiful national parks? How can we assess the benefit of clean air for our children? It is difficult to put monetary figures on these benefits, but they are ones that our taxpayers count on, and enjoy.

I ask all my colleagues to oppose this bill, avoid wasteful administrative costs, and keep our government focused on problem solving.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999, but to also express some concerns I have with the balance of this legislation. While I believe this bill is an important tool for the public to learn about the costs and benefits of federal regulations, I fear that it may prove extremely costly, in both time and resources, and could lead to delays in regulations designed to protect worker safety, human health, and the environment.

Everyone understands the impact of federal regulatory programs on our economy—they have helped Americans, with the help of American businesses and industry, to clean the air, protect wetlands, promote safe transportation, ensure healthy and abundant food supplies, improve workplace safety, and promote human health. However, each of these important steps forward comes with a cost. While many of those costs are justified, it is important that the federal government work closely with the public to develop regulations which can achieve these goals reasonably, quickly, and efficiently. H.R. 1074 may help empower Americans with new information to improve public participation and help regulators make better decisions.

For the past 2 years, I have been involved in a bi-partisan working group of Members of Congress to develop broad, consensus-based legislation in the area of environmental regulations. I remain committed to this because I believe all Americans share essentially the same goals. The environmentalists I know want to

ensure that our economy continues to grow and that Americans continue to prosper financially. And there's not a CEO I know who doesn't cherish the time spent in the great outdoors enjoying fresh air and clean water. In short, we all want clean neighborhoods, and we all want good jobs.

Broadening the information available to the public will improve this situation. Causing delay in formulating regulations will not. Americans must work together toward success. I believe the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act may help increase participation in our federal government's rule-making process. We in Congress, therefore, must commit to providing the necessary support to ensure that the Executive branch can continue its work effectively and efficiently. H.R. 1074 must not be an excuse to drain scarce agency resources or undermine the health and safety of Americans and our precious environment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today to express his support for H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act. This common sense legislation would require the Administration to submit to Congress a comprehensive annual accounting statement and report containing an estimate of the total annual costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs.

The number of regulations issued by Federal agencies have greatly increased in recent times. These regulations can have huge financial repercussions on the private sector, state and local governments and the public with little or no oversight. This Member is pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1074 which simply requires a reporting of the costs and benefits of regulations. For example, it is shocking to note that an estimate indicates that regulatory costs for 1999 will exceed \$700 billion (or \$7,000 for the average family!).

Mr. Chairman, in closing, this legislation will provide much needed accountability and will give the public access to information regarding the cumulative costs, benefits and impacts of Federal regulations. This Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 1074.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1074 and support the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment. H.R. 1074 would impose unduly burdensome analytical requirements and contain excessive provisions for consulting with State and local governments. The bill would waste huge sums of hard-earned consumers' income. The financial burden that would result would take scarce funds away from critical environmental protection and public health programs.

H.R. 1074 fails to include the costs and benefits of corporate welfare. One cannot determine the complete costs and benefits of regulations without also taking into account taxpayer-funded subsidies to the regulated corporations.

The administration opposes H.R. 1074, as do over 300 public interest organizations ranging from the AFL-CIO to the National Environmental Trust, United Auto Workers, U.S. Pirg, and the New Jersey environmental lobby in my home State. I can't remember the last time such a large and diverse range of interests united on an issue—imagine—the auto industry representatives and the environmentalists standing side by side!

The League of Conservation also is likely to score the vote on final passage as well as on the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Hoeffel-Kucinich and opposing final passage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1074

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

- (1) promote the public right-to-know about the costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs and rules;*
- (2) increase Government accountability; and*
- (3) improve the quality of Federal regulatory programs and rules.*

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the definitions under section 551 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to this Act.

(2) BENEFIT.—The term "benefit" means the reasonably identifiable significant favorable effects, quantifiable and nonquantifiable, including social, health, safety, environmental, and economic effects, that are expected to result from implementation of, or compliance with, a rule.

(3) COST.—The term "cost" means the reasonably identifiable significant adverse effects, quantifiable and nonquantifiable, including social, health, safety, environmental, and economic effects, that are expected to result from implementation of, or compliance with, a rule.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) MAJOR RULE.—The term "major rule" has the meaning that term has under section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(6) NONMAJOR RULE.—The term "nonmajor rule" means any rule, as that term is defined in section 804(3) of title 5, United States Code, other than a major rule.

(7) PAPERWORK.—The term "paperwork" has the meaning given the term "collection of information" under section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(8) PROGRAM COMPONENT.—The term "program component" means a set of related rules.

SEC. 4. ACCOUNTING STATEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 5, 2001, and on the first Monday in February of each year thereafter, the President, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall prepare and submit to the Congress an accounting statement and associated report containing an estimate of the total annual costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs, including rules and paperwork—

- (1) in the aggregate;*
- (2) by agency, agency program, and program component; and*
- (3) by major rule.*

(b) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In addition to the information required under subsection (a), the President shall include in each accounting statement under subsection (a) the following information:

- (1) An analysis of impacts of Federal rules and paperwork on Federal, State, local, and tribal government, the private sector, small business, wages, consumer prices, and economic*

growth, as well as on public health, public safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals.

(2) An identification and analysis of overlaps, duplications, and potential inconsistencies among Federal regulatory programs.

(3) Recommendations to reform inefficient or ineffective regulatory programs or program components, including recommendations for addressing market failures that are not adequately addressed by existing regulatory programs or program components.

(c) **NET BENEFITS AND COSTS.**—To the extent feasible, the Director shall, in estimates contained in any submission under subsection (a), quantify the net benefits or net costs of—

(1) each program component covered by the submission;

(2) each major rule covered by the submission; and

(3) each option for which costs and benefits were included in any regulatory impact analysis issued for any major rule covered by the submission.

(d) **SUMMARY OF REGULATORY ACTIVITY.**—The Director shall include in each submission under subsection (a) a table stating the number of major rules and the number of nonmajor rules issued by each agency in the preceding fiscal year.

(e) **YEARS COVERED BY ACCOUNTING STATEMENT.**—Each accounting statement submitted under this section shall, at a minimum—

(1) cover expected costs and benefits for the fiscal year for which the statement is submitted and each of the 4 fiscal years following that fiscal year;

(2) cover previously expected costs and benefits for each of the 2 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the statement is submitted, or the most recent revision of such costs and benefits; and

(3) with respect to each major rule, include the estimates of costs and benefits for each of the fiscal years referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) that were included in the regulatory impact analysis that was prepared for the major rule.

(f) **DELAYED APPLICATION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **APPLICATION AFTER FIRST STATEMENT.**—The following requirements shall not apply to the first accounting statement submitted under this section:

(A) The requirement under subsection (a)(2) to include estimates with respect to program components.

(B) The requirement under subsection (b)(2).

(2) **APPLICATION AFTER SECOND STATEMENT.**—The requirement under subsection (b)(1) to include analyses of impacts on wages, consumer prices, and economic growth shall not apply to the first and second accounting statements submitted under this section.

SEC. 5. NOTICE AND COMMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Before submitting an accounting statement and the associated report to Congress under section 4, and before preparing final guidelines under section 6, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) provide public notice and an opportunity of at least 60 days for submission of comments on the statement and report or guidelines, respectively; and

(2) consult with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office on the statement and report or guidelines, respectively.

(b) **APPENDIX.**—After consideration of the comments, the Director shall include an appendix to the report or guidelines, respectively, addressing the public comments and peer review comments under section 7.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF PEER REVIEW COMMENTS.**—To ensure openness, the Director shall make all final peer review comments available in their entirety to the public.

SEC. 6. GUIDELINES FROM THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Di-

rector of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Council of Economic Advisers, shall issue guidelines to agencies to standardize—

(1) most plausible measures of costs and benefits;

(2) the means of gathering information used to prepare accounting statements under this Act, including information required for impact analyses required under section 4(b)(1); and

(3) the format of information provided for accounting statements, including summary tables.

(b) **REVIEW.**—The Director shall review submissions from the agencies to ensure consistency with the guidelines under this section.

SEC. 7. PEER REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall arrange for 2 or more persons that have nationally recognized expertise in regulatory analysis and regulatory accounting and that are independent of and external to the Government, to provide peer review of each accounting statement and associated report under section 4 and the guidelines under section 6 before the statement, report, or guidelines are final.

(b) **WRITTEN COMMENTS.**—The peer review under this section shall provide written comments to the Director in a timely manner. The Director shall use the peer review comments in preparing the final statements, associated reports, and guidelines.

(c) **FACA.**—Peer review under this section shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(d) **BALANCE AND INDEPENDENCE.**—The Director shall ensure that—

(1) the persons that provide peer review under subsection (a) are fairly balanced with respect to the points of view represented;

(2) no person that provides peer review under subsection (a) has a conflict of interest that is relevant to the functions to be performed in the review; and

(3) the comments provided by those persons—

(A) are not inappropriately influenced by any special interest; and

(B) are the result of independent judgment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No amendment to that amendment shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENTS NO. 2, 3, AND 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCINTOSH

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments No. 2, 3, and 4 offered By Mr. MCINTOSH:

Page 4, line 17, strike "President" and insert "Director".

Page 7, beginning at line 5, strike "and economic growth" and insert "economic

growth, public health, public safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals".

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO CERTAIN FEDERAL BANKING AGENCIES AND MONETARY POLICY.

(a) **TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY AND DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.**—The head of each Federal banking agency (as that term is defined in section 3(z) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 181(z)) and the National Credit Union Administration, and not the Director, shall exercise all authority and carry out all duties otherwise vested under this Act in the Director with respect to that agency, other than the authority and duty to submit accounting statements and reports under section 4(a). The head of each such agency shall submit to the Director all estimates and other information required by this Act to be included in such statements and reports with respect to that agency.

(b) **EXCLUSION OF MONETARY POLICY.**—No provision of this Act shall apply to any matter relating to monetary policy that is proposed or promulgated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, let me describe these three technical amendments very briefly. We have discussed them with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) who unfortunately wanted to be here but was not able to be here when this bill was called up earlier today.

Amendment No. 2 strikes the word "President" and inserts the word "Director" which simply ensures the consistency in the use of terminology throughout the bill.

Amendment No. 3, inserting the words "public health, public safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals," delays the effective date for some of the impact analyses which OMB is required to prepare under the bill. This amendment is being offered jointly by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and me or was to be offered jointly by us.

Amendment No. 4 responds to the concerns of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) and the Federal Reserve Board. The amendment's two provisions ensure that H.R. 1074 cannot mistakenly be construed as impinging on the independence of the Fed, or as interfering in any way with monetary policy set by the Open Market Committee.

I would submit that these amendments will perfect the bill and do not change any of the substance or policy of the bill.

As I understand it, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has agreed to these, and there should not be any controversy to them.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to say that we have reviewed these amendments. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr.

KUCINICH), as the Ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, and our staff has looked them over, and we would support the en bloc amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOEFFEL

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. HOEFFEL:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . INFORMATION REGARDING OFFSETTING SUBSIDIES.

In addition to the information required under section 4, the President shall include in each accounting statement under that section an analysis of the extent to which the costs imposed on incorporated entities by Federal regulatory programs are offset by subsidies given to those entities by the Federal Government, including subsidies in the form of grants, preferential loans, preferential tax treatment, federally funded research, or use of Federal facilities, assets, or public lands at less than market value. The analysis shall—

- (1) identify such subsidies;
- (2) analyze the costs and benefits of such subsidies; and
- (3) be sufficiently specific to—
 - (A) account for the amounts of subsidies provided to the entities; and
 - (B) identify the entities that receive such subsidies.

SEC. . TAXPAYER PROTECTIONS.

(a) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The aggregate amount expended by the Director and agencies each fiscal year to carry out this Act may not exceed \$1,000,000.

(3) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any expenditure for any analysis or data generation that is required under any other law, regulation, or Executive Order and used to fulfill the requirements of this Act.

(b) SUNSET.—This Act shall have no force or effect after the expiration of the four-year-period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is designed to add to the Right-To-Know legislation in front of us a requirement that the Office of Management and Budget do a cost-benefit analysis of the corporate welfare benefits received by American companies when they do the cost-benefit analysis required by the bill on regulations written by the Federal Government.

The purpose for my amendment is to make sure that, when we give the public this information that the bill wants them to have, when we provide this right to know, not only to Congress, but to the American people, that we give them the full picture. The bill itself, as written, would not do that.

The proponents of the bill, I am sure in good faith, point out that the cost of Federal regulations is, in their estimation, high, and they want the public to know that. I understand that desire. But if we are going to go through this annual exercise of asking the Office of

Management and Budget to conduct such a study of the impact of regulations on American businesses, let us make sure we know all the facts. We should have nothing to hide, Mr. Chairman.

If these businesses that are allegedly burdened with Federal regulations receive a Federal benefit through a tax advantage, a subsidy, a preference, let us have that on the table as well. If we want to find out the costs and benefit of Federal actions, let us include all these Federal actions, not just regulations, but the corporate welfare subsidies as well.

This amendment, the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment is very much based upon the hard work done by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH). As a member of the committee, I want to compliment him for his work.

I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member, for his work. I look forward to the debate here, to work with the distinguished members of the majority, to come to a legislative decision here that gives the public what we all want the public to have, the full picture.

□ 1615

My amendment would, first, include the cost of corporate welfare in the cost-benefit analysis that we are asking to be completed by the Office of Management and Budget. Secondly, the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment would make sure that the cost of this annual study would be capped at \$1 million.

Now, the CBO has estimated the cost of the underlying bill to be less than \$500,000 a year. So we have doubled that to put a cap of \$1 million on the combined study to determine the cost of regulation and the cost of corporate welfare. That seems to me to be a rational but prudent cap to make sure that we do not have a cost overrun or a runaway study here that would cost more than any potential benefit to the public.

And, thirdly, my amendment would make sure that this entire bill will not become a perpetual drain on the Federal budget if it proves to be not as useful as the proponents hope by putting a 4-year sunset provision in the bill. If this bill is successful, we can always lift that sunset and keep these studies going on an annual basis, as long as we feel they are useful. But if these studies are not useful, then the 4-year sunset provision in my amendment would protect the taxpayers and make sure that this does not become a perpetual drain.

Mr. Chairman, we have defined corporate welfare as spending subsidies, tax preferences, below-market rate use of Federal assets, such as land for grazing or timbering or mining. These corporate welfare benefits have been estimated by Time Magazine to equal \$125 billion a year. Every year, \$125 billion, the equivalent, according to Time, of the paycheck for 2 weeks of every

working American man and woman. That is a very high cost. And we would like to see what the benefit of that is, and we would like to have this \$125 billion of estimated Federal benefit included in this study of Federal cost-benefit analysis.

Some who oppose this amendment say that it is designed to kill the bill. It is not. It is designed to make this bill whole, to make sure that we get the full picture. Without this amendment, the underlying bill does not give a full and complete picture of the impact of the Federal Government on American businesses and does not give a full picture of the benefit and cost of regulations or of corporate welfare.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Let me say in response to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), about the Hoeffel-Kucinich-Waxman amendment, a couple of different points that I think are important for us to keep in mind.

First of all, the way the amendment is worded, "burdens imposed on incorporated entities," it will sweep up into that group entities that I am not sure the gentleman had in mind when he was drafting the amendment but, nonetheless, would be included in the definition of incorporated entities. To the extent that public interest groups or not-for-profit groups are incorporated, they would also have the same analysis done on the benefits and subsidies that they receive in various Federal programs and would be required to disclose the amounts of those as a result of this report.

More fundamentally, this amendment is not related to the fundamental purpose of the bill in the sense that it opens up the entire bit of legislation to determine what type of benefits different entities in our society receive from government programs, specifically those that are incorporated in one of our various States. It is not limited to the offset on the amount of various regulations but is broad ranging.

And since every entity is affected by some legislation, it would essentially be a laundry list of all of that, subsidies as well as the effect on each of those individual players. That truly will bust the budget, if it is actually ever included in law and enacted, and, ultimately, does a great deal of damage to the core purpose of this bill by bogging it down in a direction that was not intended and, frankly, not beneficial in determining what are the impacts of Federal regulations on the private sector.

Now, I would have to say that the issue of corporate welfare is a longstanding and controversial issue which should be thoroughly debated by this House, but not in the context of a bill which we brought forward from this committee that is focusing on the regulatory burden since it goes much more, quite frankly, into spending and tax subsidies than it does to the regulatory impacts on those entities.

I would say that this Hoeffel-Waxman amendment ultimately ends up not being workable as an accounting amendment because it requires the government to do that by individual corporate entity. None of the analysis that we require currently in the bill is required by individual entity. It is, in its most detailed form, by individual rule, which has a broad application to many similar entities, but, in general, is in the aggregate of cross or different regulations and breaking down by business sectors and different functions.

So this would add a level of detail that, frankly, I am not sure anybody could come and say to us would in fact ever be workable if it were to be required.

Finally, the second part of the Waxman-Hoeffel amendment, the cap on a million dollar spending in order to require expensive new data collection and analysis are somewhat incompatible. This, I think, ends up being an amendment that is designed primarily to cripple the legislation, a gutting amendment, that would take away from the primary purpose of it; and I would urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoeffel-Kucinich-Visclosky amendment, and this is called the Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare Disclosure Amendment to H.R. 1074. Now, this amendment would protect the American taxpayer and streamline government by disclosing the cost and benefits of corporate welfare and placing common sense limits on the cost of this legislation to \$1 million a year. It would also sunset the reporting requirements after 4 years, thus assuring that we do not continue to require this if it is not achieving its goals.

H.R. 1074 ignores the fact that each year the Federal Government provides billions of dollars in corporate welfare to regulated businesses. In fact, the conservative Cato Institute recently estimated that corporations receive over \$75 billion annually from the Federal Government. Time Magazine puts this total at \$125 billion. This amendment would require corporate welfare to be disclosed to the American public so that they can have a complete accounting of the costs and benefits imposed by the Federal Government.

For example, as currently worded, H.R. 1074 would require OMB to report on the cost to industry of clean air regulations promulgated under the Clean Air Act, but it would not include any of the \$2 billion in Federal subsidies allocated to the coal industries through the Clean Coal Technology Program, which assists private companies in developing technologies which helps them comply with these regulations.

This amendment, on which I am pleased to have had the participation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL), who has shown real leadership on this issue of challenging corporate welfare, this amendment

would not only ensure that the public gets a more complete understanding of the actual cost of Federal regulations, it would also help the American public decide whether such subsidies to large profitable corporations are worthwhile.

As Ralph Nader recently testified at the House Committee on the Budget hearing, "There is only one change that will counteract the entrenched interest which create, shield, and rationalize corporate welfare programs: an informed and mobilized citizenry."

The amendment would also protect taxpayers by limiting the funds that could be spent on these analyses. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing H.R. 1074 would cost less than \$500,000 a year. According to the letter, this estimate "assumes that the statement submitted under H.R. 1074 would be similar to those previously submitted by OMB, which have relied on existing information, such as the agency's analysis of new rules to estimate the aggregate costs and benefits of Federal regulations."

Similar information also exists on corporate welfare, so we believe that doubling the estimate should provide plenty of funds for OMB to produce this report on both the costs and benefits of regulations and the costs of benefits of corporate welfare.

Finally, this amendment would sunset the bill after a reasonable time so Congress can evaluate if it makes sense to continue these analyses.

Mr. Chairman, this is a common sense amendment. It provides the American taxpayers with additional information about the costs and benefits of regulatory programs. It prevents us from spending unlimited amounts of money analyzing minor and non-controversial regulations and does this without limiting cost-benefit analyses that are already required under other laws and executive orders.

It is an amendment that I would hope all budget conscious Members of Congress would support. Furthermore, I think that as this issue comes up in the future, we should be able to see a growing bipartisan support for measures which challenge corporate welfare. At a time when the American people are struggling to make ends meet, when many households are worried about Social Security, are worried about Medicare, we certainly should make sure that those who have the most benefits in this society also have to disclose to the American public just how much money is getting to them.

So I have been pleased to work with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) on the other side of the aisle in trying to craft the overall bill, though I am sorry we do not agree on the details; but I think this is one amendment that I hope we can find a way to come to some concurrence on.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, in drafting the amendment, does the gentleman know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL) or any of the other Members have considered the impact of identifying the individual corporation in terms of some of the protections of privacy under the Internal Revenue Code? Right now we have a fairly elaborate system in place where an individual taxpayer's information is not revealed when government analyzes different tax information.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if somebody is getting billions of dollars in subsidies from the Federal taxpayers, I personally do not believe they should be entitled to any commitment of privacy. The American people want to know where their money is going. However, I respect the import of the gentleman's question.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a couple of the points that the gentleman mentioned and also just mention that I would like to speak in favor of the Kucinich-Waxman-Hoeffel amendment. However, I am unable to speak in favor of this amendment because the two policies contained in this amendment, although in and of themselves are good policies, fine policies, but put together in one amendment they are actually self-defeating.

What I mean when I say that is this amendment is a contradiction because it will increase the cost of the study and then it will cap it. I understand that the gentleman has not certified whether the CBO has scored the cost of a new corporate welfare study, but not knowing the cost of a new corporate welfare study and then throwing on top a million dollar cap is self-defeating.

The amendment provides a convenient excuse for OMB to refuse to perform the analysis due to costs. Even if a study would normally not go over \$1 million, as OMB has said, absent a corporate welfare study, the increased requirement of a corporate welfare analysis would provide an even stronger incentive for OMB to argue that it is impossible to remain within these caps.

Mr. Chairman, one additional point that I think is very worthwhile noting, as I was just reading the gentleman's amendment, and I would like to mention that I would love to work with the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from California, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania on ridding corporate welfare from the Federal Government because I, too, believe we should not be subsidizing these types of business arrangements; but in reading the definitions contained in the amendment, it says "incorporated entities." Well, incorporated entities could mean hundreds of thousands of small businesses, such as lawyers, doctors, dentists, and even municipalities.

So I think the way the amendment is drafted it is drafted in such a way that

it will give us precisely what the gentleman from California feared, and that was requiring OMB to do so many analyses that it will prevent them from doing their other priority work. It will require OMB to go down not just to the big corporate giants that are getting the advanced technology grants and the other corporate welfare grants that we, as a team, want to get rid of, but going to the dentists, going to the municipalities, going to the doctors.

The definition of incorporated entities is too vague, which gives OMB a chance to say this will cost too much, this will exceed \$1 million. So by combining the laudatory goal of going after corporate welfare with the \$1 million cap, the gentleman is essentially killing the bill.

□ 1630

They are essentially rendering this bill absolutely unworkable by saying OMB will not be able to do this, it is going to cost too much and, therefore, will have no cost-benefit analysis at all.

If the gentleman would be willing to work on a separate piece of legislation going after the issue of corporate welfare aside from this legislation, I think we could get a wonderful bipartisan team together and really advance this bill and clean up the definition of "incorporated entities."

If that would be the case, I think we would have a winner here. But, sadly, this amendment is nothing short of killing the bill. A vote for this amendment is a vote against the Right-to-Know Act. It is a vote against cost-benefit analysis.

So I urge a "no" vote on this and a "yes" vote on final passage.

Mr. HOFFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOFFEL. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that the information we are seeking is surely in the computers of every agency that exists in the Federal Government.

We are really asking OMB to collect information, not to create an entirely new procedure here. So the cost of the corporate welfare study is surely within half a million dollars.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL) what is the definition of "incorporated entity" and has he taken into consideration that incorporated entities could very well mean a dentist's office, a doctor's office, a municipality, a law firm, something like that?

Mr. HOFFEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, an incorporated entity is just that, entities incorporated under Federal law.

The reality is that no matter who is included in that, again, the benefits, the tax breaks, the special subsidies, if they are going to an incorporated entity, that information is available to the Federal Government.

We have never asked anyone to collect it before. That is what this amendment would do. I tell the gentleman that I do have a corporate welfare commission bill that I hope he will cosponsor with me.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the problem that I see with this bill is that incorporated entities and requiring the OMB to study incorporated entities could go down the road of going in to seeing whether anything the Federal Government does benefits something as small as a doctor's office or a dentist's office could be considered corporate welfare.

We all know that the intent of this is to allow us to be better empowered to stop big, multimillion-dollar grants to very large corporations. But it is my fear that this amendment is not written that way.

On top of it, we do not know how much this is going to cost. And I know the gentleman is concerned about costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RYAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me explore with the gentleman that point that he raised.

The gentleman thinks that the cost burden of preparing the analysis on corporate welfare would exceed the million-dollar total amount that we would limit for this whole exercise of the evaluations.

Now, we have a CBO estimate on the amount of the analysis cost for the regulatory side, and they say it is \$500,000.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, a figure that the gentleman disputes.

Mr. WAXMAN. I do dispute it. But suppose we said, for that side of the ledger, we will go to a million dollars and then we would say for the analysis on the corporate welfare side we will not put a limit on it. Would that bring the gentleman to the point of supporting this amendment?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman were to remove the cap altogether, I personally would not have a problem. I would have to refer to my colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee.

But if the million-dollar cap were removed, I think that would go quite a ways farther in ensuring something like this. But I do think the definition "incorporated entities" does have to be cleaned up.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, on exactly that point, I think the amendment, frankly it needs to have hearings if we are going to think about it as serious legislation.

I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL) say he thought incorporated entities were those incorporated under Federal law. I have a suspicion he meant also under State law. Because there is only a handful of corporations incorporated under Federal law, whereas the vast bulk of private-sector corporate entities are incorporated under State laws.

That is a question we will have to explore and answer. And to identify each of those entities that receives a subsidy has some very important privacy concerns.

So I would be reluctant to concede that we could change the cost side and not address those serious problems on the first part of this amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think what we have here is the basis for a working relationship for another vehicle to do some hearings in our committee to work on this issue together.

But at this time, with an amendment that is written in a very sketchy way that has so many open-ended definitions that does cap the ability of OMB to do this where this corporate welfare analysis is not scored by CBO, so we just do not have enough knowledge to know whether this falls within the cap or outside the cap. I think it is unworkable at this time.

I would like to add that this amendment is key voted as a "no" vote by the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

I think though, however, we have something we can work with. Hopefully, we can work together after passage of the final passage. I hope we defeat this amendment. But I would like to urge my colleagues that maybe we could get a relationship and work together on this in the committee. We have to tighten up the definition and do something that is good for our country.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I strongly support this amendment. The amendment has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY). It is called the Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare Disclosure amendment.

I am honored that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) would call it the Waxman amendment, but it is not officially the Waxman amendment. I have not offered it. But I support it.

This amendment does two important things. First, it protects taxpayers. As written, this bill would require OMB to prepare a cost-benefit analysis of every regulation no matter how small or ministerial.

This makes no sense. We do not need analysis for the sake of analysis. We should target our analysis to those major or controversial rules that are in genuine dispute.

My concern is that the cost is going to run out of control. That is why this amendment would place a cap on the amount of taxpayer funds that can be spent on that analysis of \$1 million, which is twice what CBO says should be spent on this bill.

Now, it is interesting how the other side has done a quick pivot. They said, oh, this bill is not going to cost much money. It is only \$500,000, and it is well worth it. But then when we have challenged that figure and said, all right, we will accept double the amount of CBO, but we think it is going to cost more, let us at least be sure that we limit it, they come around and say, oh, no, no, no. We cannot limit it because it may cost more.

Well, one of my colleagues said, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Either it is going to cost \$500,000 or under a million or it is going to cost more. And if it is going to cost more, I think it is going to be wasteful.

I tried to pursue a minute ago with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) the idea that maybe we put the cap of a million dollars simply on the regulatory analysis and not on the corporate welfare side. But then the response was back that he did not want any cap at all.

Well, I want a cap for one reason. I want to protect the taxpayers from having their money wasted on analysis for no purpose.

This amendment is important to do now in this bill. We were told, let us work out another piece of legislation. Let us develop a relationship. We will talk about it in committee. We will talk about it after the bill passes.

Well, the leadership of our committee, which is controlled by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), have not given us a hearing on this. Mr. MCINTOSH said, oh, we cannot do this. We have not had a hearing. They are not willing to call a hearing on this idea of corporate welfare. We have had no hearings on the issue.

We were told when we had the mandates bill, we said, well, if you are going to mandate and require a separate vote in the House before there is a mandate, let us do that when it comes to protection of the environment. We were told, well, that is something that should be in another piece of legislation.

This amendment belongs in this bill. It would add balance to the bill. The bill as written requires analysis of the costs of Federal programs to regulated entities. The amendment would require OMB to also look at the benefits of Federal programs to corporations through various types of what we would call corporate welfare.

Each year the Federal Government gives out billions in subsidies to successful businesses in the form of preferential tax treatment, subsidized loans, grants, and the use of Federal land, assets and facilities at below-market costs.

Many might think that a Congress that has worked so hard to take people off welfare might also try to force successful corporations off welfare as well. But just the opposite is true.

Let us understand what is going on here. Last week this House, on a partisan vote, passed H.R. 2488. I consider it an irresponsible tax bill that does nothing to ensure the long-term solvency of Medicare and Social Security.

What it does do is disproportionately provide its tax benefits to the wealthy, to corporations, to businesses, not to ordinary people who pay taxes.

This tax bill was passed largely on party lines. It contains almost a hundred billion dollars in new direct tax breaks to businesses.

Now, many might want to keep this information secret about these tax breaks. But I think the public has a right to know who we are giving our money to.

The Congressional Research Service has determined that there is not a comprehensive list of subsidized industries. We do not know where all the Federal tax breaks are going to businesses. We do not know where all the grants and the other indirect subsidies are going.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAXMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, we know if the Hoeffel-Kucinich-Visclosky amendment were adopted it would cure this problem by requiring each year the Office of Management and Budget to identify Federal subsidies and disclose the costs and benefits of these subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, if the intent of this bill is to provide more information to the American people about the relationship between regulated entities and the Federal Government, this amendment will very much help accomplish that goal. There is no reason the American people should not be informed about how their tax dollars are being used to subsidize corporations.

I have heard this argument, what if the person or entity getting a subsidy is an individual business, therefore, you are going to presumably invade their privacy or make it too difficult to understand where the money by way of corporate subsidies actually goes?

Well, that is a sham. These corporate entities can be stated in the aggregate. They are topics. It is not a doctor's office. It is how much doctors get. It is not a subsidy to one corporation. It can be corporations in a particular enterprise. And in that way we will know how much of a benefit is being placed on these corporations when we ask them to clean up the environment and protect public health, when we ask them to come in and make sure their drugs are safe and effective and to get approved by the FDA.

We also ought to know, on the other hand, whether we give them subsidies

that help them deal with that burden, as we do so often to corporations that take advantage of special tax breaks and special grants and special preferential treatments in the use of Federal assets.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 258, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) will be postponed.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1074) to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 258 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1074.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1074) to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman

from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOFFEL.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL) on which further proceedings were postponed, and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 217, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—192

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Ackerman	Hill (IN)	Ortiz
Allen	Hilliard	Owens
Andrews	Hinchey	Pallone
Baird	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Baldacci	Hoefel	Pastor
Baldwin	Holt	Payne
Barcia	Hoolley	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hoyer	Phelps
Becerra	Inslee	Pomeroy
Berkley	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Bilbray	(TX)	Rangel
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Reyes
Boehlert	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Bonior	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Borski	Kaptur	Roemer
Boswell	Kasich	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Kennedy	Roukema
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Royce
Campbell	Kind (WI)	Rush
Capps	King (NY)	Sabo
Capuano	Klecza	Sanchez
Cardin	Klink	Sanders
Carson	Kucinich	Sawyer
Clay	LaFalce	Saxton
Clayton	Lampson	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lantos	Scott
Conyers	Larson	Serrano
Costello	Lazio	Shays
Coyne	Leach	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sherwood
Cummings	Levin	Skelton
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Lowe	Snyder
DeGette	Luther	Spratt
Delahunt	Maloney (CT)	Stabenow
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Deutsch	Markey	Strickland
Dicks	Mascara	Stupak
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Engel	McGovern	Tierney
Eshoo	McKinney	Trafigant
Etheridge	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Evans	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Velazquez
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Vento
Foley	Menendez	Visclosky
Forbes	Millender-Ford	Walsh
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Waters
Franks (NJ)	Miller, George	Watt (NC)
Frelinghuysen	Minge	Waxman
Frost	Mink	Weiner
Gejdenson	Moakley	Weldon (PA)
Gephardt	Moore	Wexler
Gilman	Moran (VA)	Weygand
Gonzalez	Morella	Wise
Green (TX)	Nadler	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Wu
Hall (OH)	Neal	Wynn
	Obey	

NOES—217

Aderholt	Goodling	Pickering
Archer	Goss	Pickett
Armey	Graham	Pitts
Bachus	Green (WI)	Pombo
Baker	Greenwood	Porter
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Portman
Barr	Hall (TX)	Quinn
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Radanovich
Bartlett	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Barton	Hayes	Regula
Bass	Hayworth	Reynolds
Bateman	Hefley	Riley
Bentsen	Herger	Rogan
Bereuter	Hill (MT)	Rogers
Berry	Hilleary	Rohrabacher
Biggert	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Hoekstra	Ryan (WI)
Bishop	Holden	Ryun (KS)
Bliley	Horn	Salmon
Blunt	Hostettler	Sandlin
Boehner	Houghton	Sanford
Bonilla	Hulshof	Scarborough
Bono	Hutchinson	Schaffer
Boucher	Hyde	Sensenbrenner
Boyd	Isakson	Sessions
Brady (TX)	Istook	Shadegg
Bryant	Jenkins	Shaw
Burr	John	Shimkus
Burton	Johnson (CT)	Shows
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Shuster
Callahan	Jones (NC)	Simpson
Calvert	Kelly	Sisisky
Camp	Kingston	Skeen
Canady	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Castle	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Chabot	Kuykendall	Smith (WA)
Chambliss	LaHood	Souder
Clement	Largent	Spence
Coble	Latham	Stearns
Collins	LaTourette	Stenholm
Combest	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Condit	Lewis (KY)	Sununu
Cook	Linder	Sweeney
Cooksey	LoBiondo	Talent
Cramer	Lofgren	Tancredo
Cunningham	Lucas (KY)	Tanner
Danner	Lucas (OK)	Tauscher
Davis (VA)	Manzullo	Tauzin
Deal	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	McHugh	Terry
DeMint	McInnis	Thomas
Diaz-Balart	McIntosh	Thornberry
Dickey	McIntyre	Thune
Dooley	McKeon	Tiahrt
Doolittle	Metcalf	Toomey
Dreier	Mica	Towns
Duncan	Miller (FL)	Turner
Dunn	Miller, Gary	Upton
Edwards	Mollohan	Vitter
Ehlers	Moran (KS)	Walden
Emerson	Myrick	Wamp
English	Nethercutt	Watkins
Everett	Ney	Watts (OK)
Ewing	Northup	Weldon (FL)
Fletcher	Norwood	Weller
Fowler	Nussle	Whitfield
Gallegly	Ose	Wicker
Gekas	Oxley	Wilson
Gibbons	Packard	Wolf
Gilchrest	Paul	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Pease	Young (FL)
Goode	Peterson (MN)	
Goodlatte	Petri	

NOT VOTING—24

Blagojevich	Ehrlich	Martinez
Cannon	Farr	McCollum
Chenoweth	Fossella	McDermott
Coburn	Ganske	Murtha
Cox	Gordon	Oberstar
Crane	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Cubin	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Dixon	Johnson, E. B.	Taylor (NC)

□ 1825

Mr. BOYD changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 335, I was unable to get here to vote due

to inclement weather in the metro New York City area. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1074) to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 258, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 157, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—254

Aderholt	Burr	Diaz-Balart
Archer	Burton	Dickey
Armey	Buyer	Dooley
Bachus	Callahan	Doolittle
Baker	Calvert	Doyle
Ballenger	Camp	Dreier
Barr	Campbell	Duncan
Barrett (NE)	Canady	Dunn
Bartlett	Cannon	Edwards
Barton	Castle	Ehlers
Bass	Chabot	Emerson
Bateman	Chambliss	English
Bentsen	Clayton	Etheridge
Bereuter	Clement	Everett
Berry	Coble	Ewing
Biggert	Collins	Fletcher
Bilirakis	Combest	Foley
Bishop	Condit	Ford
Bliley	Cook	Fowler
Blunt	Cooksey	Franks (NJ)
Boehner	Cox	Frelinghuysen
Bonilla	Cramer	Gallegly
Bono	Cunningham	Gekas
Boswell	Danner	Gibbons
Boucher	Davis (VA)	Gillmor
Boyd	Deal	Goode
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Goodlatte
Bryant	DeMint	Goodling

Goss
Graham
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)

McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalfe
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northrup
Norwood
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott

NOT VOTING—22

Blagojevich
Chenoweth
Coburn
Crane
Cubin
Dixon
Ehrlich
Farr

Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

McDermott
Murtha
Oberstar
Peterson (PA)
Pryce (OH)
Taylor (NC)

□ 1843

Mr. STUPAK changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 336, I was unable to get to vote due to inclement weather in the metro New York City area. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

Stated against:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall numbers 335 and 336, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on each rollcall vote.

□ 1845

REPORT ON PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS IN BOSNIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-104)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 of Public Law 105-174, the 1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act, I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on progress made toward achieving benchmarks for a sustainable peace process.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 23, 1999.

REPORTS ON NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT OF 1966, HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT AND MOTOR VEHICLE INFORMATION AND COST SAVINGS ACT OF 1972—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objec-

tion, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1996 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Highway Safety Act, and the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1972, as amended.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1999.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-263) on the resolution (H. Res. 260) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2587) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2605, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-264) on the resolution (H. Res. 261) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FAIRNESS FOR VETERANS

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, colleagues I rise today in support of the action taken earlier today by Vice President AL GORE on behalf of our Nation's veterans. The Vice President has announced that the administration will seek an additional \$1 billion fully paid for to ensure our Nation can continue to provide quality and timely health care for our veterans.

America's veterans and many Members of Congress have been speaking out loudly in the past months for an increase in the veterans budget for fiscal year 2000. I am pleased and proud that the administration has heard our call.

The Vice President's action is a vital step toward keeping the promise that was made to our veterans when they

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Billbray
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell

NOES—157

Doggett
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jones (OH)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson

Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markley
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Rahall

joined the Armed Forces and made their promise to serve their country. We will begin to meet the long-term care needs of our aging veterans. We will begin to lower the waiting times for our medical appointments that veterans have to endure now.

Mr. Speaker, after years of flat line budgets, this action is sorely needed. I salute this move taken by the Vice President this morning.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HARD TIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I spoke on this House floor about the crisis facing farmers and ranchers. This evening, I continue my efforts to inform my colleagues about the seriousness of the issues and the need to act now.

Last week, I introduced with some of my colleagues legislation that takes an important step to help producers make it through this period of extremely low prices. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2568, the Market Loss Assistance Act of 1999. This straightforward bill provides producers an immediate shot in the arm. Under this bill, producers would receive an additional payment equal to 75 percent of their current farm payment. While this is only one part of a solution to help producers, it is an important part, and it provides immediate assistance. We need to assure our farmers that relief is on its way. Let us begin the debate on disaster assistance now.

Part of the problem is the loss of exports. In 1996, agricultural exports hit a record of \$59.9 billion, and since then, agricultural exports have fallen substantially. This year, exports are predicted to be \$49 billion for a loss of over 18 percent since 1996, just 3 years ago.

Not surprisingly, as exports have fallen, so has net farm income. Since 1996, net farm income has fallen to \$45 billion, a decline of 15 percent. That \$45 billion net farm income now stands at the same level as a decade ago. Does anyone think the cost of fertilizer, land payments, equipment, and other farm inputs have remained the same price for the last decade? Of course not.

In the world of agricultural export promotion we have lost the battle on behalf of farmers, and if the current trend continues, we may soon lose the war.

This chart paints a very clear picture on where the United States is on its commitment to helping American farmers and ranchers compete around the world. About \$8.45 billion is spent

each year on agricultural subsidies. Of this, the United States represents \$122 million or roughly only 1.4 percent.

We repeatedly tell our farmers and ranchers to produce for the world and compete for world markets. When your principle export competitor is the European community, the battle for market share under these conditions does not take long. In 1996, the EU spent 69 times more than we spent for export assistance. We cannot let this go on.

Out of this pie, 83.5 percent of the export assistance programs are spent by the European community. Ours are 2.5 percent.

When I first arrived in Congress, the Department of Agriculture indicated that we could not use export promotion funding because prices were too high and that shipping our U.S. farm products overseas might make them even more expensive. Now I am told we cannot use export funds because it would drive the prices even lower; a story I find particularly hard to believe in light of tight storage situation and low farm prices already well under the loan rate.

If the bitter medicine of low prices must be taken, I would recommend we aggressively work through this period and move U.S. agricultural products. Our farmers are locked in a battle competing for international markets. We cannot continue to abandon them. We must use our export programs forcefully, and we must act now.

Mr. Speaker, farmers are willing to compete in the global marketplace, but they cannot compete with foreign treasuries. I urge all my colleagues to join in the fight for the American farmer. We need short term disaster assistance; and for the long run, we need agricultural exports.

PROTECT OUR GREAT LAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, last October you and our colleagues gave unanimous consent to my House Resolution which called on the President and the other Body to act to prevent the sale or diversion of Great Lakes water to foreign countries, businesses, corporations, and individuals. The House of Representatives, speaking with one voice, asked that procedures be established to guarantee that any sale or diversion be fully negotiated and approved by representatives of the United States Government and the Government of Canada in consultation with effective States and provinces.

I want to remind our colleagues of that House action, Mr. Speaker, because there is another threat to the Great Lakes, one posed by drilling for gas and oil in and under the waters of this great natural resource.

Mr. Speaker, we are not being alarmists. Water diversion and drilling for gas and oil are real threats to one of the world's most valuable resources.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, these facts. As I list each item, I want you to think about each of these facts in terms of potential impact on our Great Lakes.

Seventy percent of the Earth's surface is covered by water; 97.5 percent of that water is sea water. Only 2.5 percent of the surface water is fresh water. The Great Lakes contains 6 quadrillion gallons of fresh water, one-fifth of the Earth's fresh water resources.

The Great Lakes are home to 40 million people. One-quarter of Canada's population lives in the Great Lakes basin.

The World Bank predicts that by about the year 2025 more than 3 billion people in 52 countries will suffer water shortages for drinking or sanitation. More than 300 cities in China are currently experiencing water shortages, and more than 100 are deemed to be in condition of acute water scarcity. The global demand for water is doubling every 21 years.

Citizens of the United States and Canada use and consume more than 100 gallons per day per person. Eighty percent of the fresh water used goes to agricultural production.

I thank the Buffalo News for many of those facts, Mr. Speaker. I present them as random facts because like pieces of a puzzle they must be analyzed and arranged to see their importance.

The World Bank has studied this puzzle, and I call your attention to a quote from a World Bank report which appeared in the Buffalo News in a March 1999 story. The World Bank report predicted wars of the next century will be fought over fresh water.

So are we really being alarmists? I believe not.

A company in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, just one company, was given a permit last year to take up the 2.6 million gallons of water per day for 5 years from Lake Superior. I was joined by members of the Ontario parliament and the Canadian New Democratic Party in bringing public attention to this permit which was revoked by the Ontario government, but all fresh water will increasingly be eyed as a potential commodity.

A Vancouver-based company, Global Water Corporation, has an agreement with an Alaskan community of Sitka to take fresh water from a lake and ship it by tanker to China. The deal allows Global to take up to 5 billion gallons a year for 30 years. Global envisions 445 tankers per year carrying fresh water to Asia.

Now we have spoken of just two companies. We know the market is there. We can easily see the overhead is minimal, the market is expanding and the potential number of speculators and potential shippers is unlimited.

Let me say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that although I have mentioned China twice in my remarks, I am not attempting to invoke it as threat to our own security. China is merely a customer in need of fresh water now. The

entire world will be eying our natural resource.

As of today, the issue of sale and diversion of Great Lakes water and fresh water throughout this country remains unsolved. Following the House vote on my resolution, the U.S. and Canada have asked the International Joint Commission to study the issue on water diversion along the entire border from Alaska to the St. Lawrence River to Maine. Their preliminary report on diversion should be ready in August.

A final report on our joint water resources should be completed early next year. Until all questions on the sale or diversion of fresh water are answered, I have introduced legislation which would place a moratorium on any sale or diversion of fresh water in this country until we have these questions answered.

In the meantime, there is another threat to the Great Lakes as it is the policy of my home State of Michigan to allow drilling for gas and oil underneath the Great Lakes. Canada allows gas rigs drilling directly into Lake Ontario now. Proponents of oil drilling in the Great Lakes say the risk is minimal, small, tiny. I say tiny is too big. A gallon of oil spilled in Lake Superior would take 999 years to flow out, to be cleared by natural flow. Lake Michigan, 99 years; Lake Huron, 60 years.

Fresh water is a precious, scarce resource that needs our protection from exploitation of oil and gas companies and by sale and diversion of water.

□ 1900

IN THE SPIRIT OF THE ADA, WE MUST PASS H.R. 1180

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago today, President Bush signed the Americans with Disabilities Act into law. Since my election to the House later that same year and as a Minnesota State Senator from 1981 to 1990, I have worked hard to help people with disabilities live up to their full potential. That is why I, like many Members of this Chamber, strongly support the Americans with Disabilities Act, and we celebrate its enactment. But, Mr. Speaker, much more work needs to be done.

In signing the ADA, President Bush noted the law is designed "to ensure that people with disabilities are given the basic guarantees for which they have worked so long and so hard: independence, freedom of choice, control of their lives, the opportunity to blend fully and equally into the rich mosaic of the American mainstream."

As we celebrate the anniversary of this historic legislation, we reflect on all that has been achieved for people with disabilities. We must also, however, address where we have failed to empower people with disabilities.

In 1990, President Bush, in signing that historic act, reminded us that many of our fellow citizens with disabilities are unemployed. They want to work, and they can work. This is a tremendous pool of people who will bring to jobs diversity, loyalty, low turnover rate, and only one request: the chance to prove themselves.

Mr. Speaker, despite the remarkably low unemployment rate in America today, people with disabilities are still asking for this chance to prove themselves in the workplace. A recent Harris poll found that unemployment among people with disabilities is between 70 and 75 percent. Think of that: 70 to 75 percent, or three-quarters of people with disabilities are unemployed in America today. Historically, fewer than 1 percent of people with disabilities leave the SSI and SSDI rolls following successful rehabilitation. Individuals with disabilities have insufficient access to and choice of services they need to become employed. Most SSI and SSDI beneficiaries are never even offered rehabilitation services.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the ADA sought to improve this situation. But the ADA did not remove all the barriers within the current Federal programs that prohibit people with disabilities from working. It is time to eliminate work disincentives for people with disabilities. Eliminating work disincentives for people with disabilities is not just humane public policy, it is sound fiscal policy. It is not just the right thing to do, it is also the cost-effective thing to do.

President Bush knew that discouraging people with disabilities from working, from earning a regular paycheck, paying taxes and moving off public assistance actually results in reduced Federal revenues. He noted, and I am quoting again: "When you add together the Federal, State, local and private funds, it costs almost \$200 billion annually to support Americans with disabilities. In effect, to keep them dependent." And that was in 1990, Mr. Speaker. We certainly spend more than that today to keep people with disabilities dependent on the system.

Like everyone else, people with disabilities have to make decisions based on financial reality. Should they consider returning to work, or even making it through vocational rehabilitation, the risk of losing vital Federal health benefits often becomes too threatening to future financial stability. As a result, Mr. Speaker, they are compelled not to work.

Given the sorry state of present law, that is generally a reasonable and a rational decision for people with disabilities. The National Council on Disabilities said it best in its report to the 105th Congress on removing barriers to work when it wrote: "Social Security programs can be transformed from a lifelong entitlement into an investment in employment potential for thousands of individuals." Transforming these Federal programs to

springboards into the work force is a goal of legislation that I cosponsored in the House with the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) and many others on both sides of the aisle, the Work Incentives Improvement Act, or H.R. 1180. This critical legislation has been passed by the Committee on Commerce and a similar bill has been approved by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, preventing people from working runs counter to the American spirit, one that thrives on individual achievements and the larger contributions to society that result. We must not rest until we pass the Work Incentives Improvement Act. People with disabilities deserve the opportunity to fulfill their dreams. Let us give them the chance to prove themselves now.

RECOGNIZE THE KASHMIRI PANDITS AS A MINORITY GROUP UNDER INDIAN LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, although the world welcomes the apparent withdrawal this month of Pakistani forces from India's side of the line of control in Kashmir, we are continually reminded of the dangerous situation that still exists in that mountainous region.

Last Wednesday's New York Times reported that 20 Hindus were killed in 3 incidents before dawn last Tuesday in what the newspaper suggested could be a stepped-up campaign of hit-and-run tactics by Muslim insurgents in remote areas of the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir. I am sad to have to report that these kinds of attacks are nothing new, Mr. Speaker.

The worst of these attacks in the village of Lihota left 15 dead. Last week's violence was the fourth mass killing in Kashmir in just 3 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, this spring, when Islamic militants had been infiltrating India's territory with the support of, and active collaboration with, Pakistan, the world took notice. The fact that India and Pakistan are both nuclear powers stirred up fears of a wider war. When it became apparent even to Pakistan's ruler that their gambit in Kashmir was both a military and a propaganda disaster, the Pakistani Government reverted to its traditional ploy by trying to internationalize the conflict by bringing in the United States as a mediator, an effort that our administration has wisely resisted.

However, Mr. Speaker, the prospect of an India-Pakistan war obscures the ongoing violence that has destroyed the life of this entire region. While people of all faiths have suffered, the Hindu community of Kashmir has been particularly severe. The Pandits have suffered as individuals, singled out for violence, and as a community, forced to leave their ancestral homes and way of life, turned into refugees in their own country.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the ongoing unique suffering of the Kashmiri Pandits, I am urging the Indian government to recognize the Kashmir Pandit community as a minority under Indian law to provide additional benefits and protection. While Hindus are the majority religion in India as whole, they are a minority, and indeed, a persecuted minority in Jammu and Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the chairman of the National Minority Commission has proposed that Hindu minorities in various Indian states be officially classified as minorities. The chairman's recommendation is pending before the government. Although such a designation would usually require an amendment to be passed by the parliament, the Lok Sabha, the lower House of the Indian Parliament, there may be occasions where the commission can unilaterally act.

While the details of such an action are obviously an internal matter for India's government, I soon will be circulating a letter to India's Prime Minister Vajpayee, which I hope my colleagues in Congress will join me in signing, urging that the appropriate steps be taken to provide the Pandits with the minority designation.

Mr. Speaker, the militants, with Pakistan's backing, have transformed a peaceful, secular state in India, one which happens to have a predominantly Muslim population, into a killing field. The militants make no secret of their desire to drive the Pandits out of Kashmir and do not think twice about killing as many of them as possible. And under such a severe, violent threat to their very existence, I believe that the designation of minority status is an urgent priority and respectfully urge the Indian Government to make this designation.

While I understand the enormity of the challenge, I urge Prime Minister Vajpayee and his government to create an environment in which the Pandit community can return to their homeland in the Kashmir Valley in the future. I also urge that the government of India raise the ongoing genocide of the Kashmiri Pandit community in bilateral talks with Pakistan.

I have the highest regard for Prime Minister Vajpayee, both personally and in his capacity as the elected leader of the world's largest democracy. I know he also grieves over the victimization of the Kashmiri Pandit community, and I hope to work closely with the Indian Government with the support of the Kashmiri-American community in resolving this humanitarian crisis.

SECURITY AT OUR NATIONAL LABS—WE MUST ALL BE CONCERNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week I came to the floor to talk about Chinese espionage, something that seems to be missing in media coverage. A couple of weeks ago, an interview on The O'Reilly Factor caught my attention. Bill O'Reilly spoke with Lieutenant Colonel Edward McCallum, the director of Security and Safeguards for the Department of Energy. After 9 years serving in this position, Colonel McCallum has been placed on administrative leave and his job has been threatened.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel McCallum has a long and distinguished military career. The colonel is an individual who takes his job as a defender of our Nation and our constitutional rights seriously. Colonel McCallum has dedicated his life to protecting the citizens and the critical national security interests of America; and now, he is being punished because he came forward with facts surrounding espionage at our research and weapons laboratories.

Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton appointed Hazel O'Leary Energy Secretary, a dangerously casual attitude invaded the Department of Energy. Colonel McCallum has said that as security was relaxed and even cut, he and members of his staff repeatedly contacted Secretary O'Leary's office urging her to take measures to protect our sensitive technology. Unfortunately, their efforts were ignored. This destructive management style began with Secretary O'Leary, but similar efforts to urge Secretary Bill Richardson to protect the security of our weapons laboratories has been stonewalled.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough to think that our national security has been compromised. Now the same government that fails to recognize the gravity of stolen national security secrets is penalizing individuals like Colonel McCallum who fought and continued fighting for the safety and protection of our Nation. This is outrageous and completely unacceptable. It was Colonel McCallum's responsibility as the director of Security and Safeguards to make the Department aware of how to better protect U.S. technology; and yet, when he and Members of his staff tried to bring attention to the issue and make changes, nobody listened, or worse, chose to ignore his warnings.

This begs the question: What else could have been stolen and who else could have gained access to this information? What new information is now available to other nations that threaten each and every citizen, and why are we not more concerned?

Mr. Speaker, the safety and protection of our national security is an issue of critical national importance. We must commend, not penalize, men and women like Colonel McCallum whose dedication and commitment to this country is so strong that they would risk losing their jobs and their livelihood to protect America.

We know this administration is responsible for compromising our na-

tional security. At the very least, that is unforgivable. In administrations of greater accountability, these acts would have been labeled treasonous. Instead, they would like to quiet Colonel McCallum and bury this messy espionage issue.

This is an issue with serious consequences for each of us. When our national security is compromised, so too is the safety of each and every American. Unfortunately, this concern is lost on many Americans. The advances gained by other nations make all Americans more vulnerable. As such, we should all be concerned; we all must be concerned.

Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to appear on The O'Reilly Factor to talk about Chinese espionage and Colonel McCallum's quest for the truth. As Mr. O'Reilly and I discussed, something must be done for the colonel and the American people who rely on the government to protect and defend them and their way of life. Like all Americans, Colonel McCallum deserves protection. While the administration is threatening his job simply for telling the truth, they threaten security and safety of us all.

Mr. Speaker, it has become clear that the President and the administration are not committed to our national security, nor are they committed to the individuals who dedicate their lives to protecting it. Therefore, my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I joined together to send a letter to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, asking the colonel to testify before the committee about this grave matter. With help from Fox News and Bill O'Reilly, we have aggressively followed and reported on this subject.

We can continue informing the American people how this administration has compromised our national security. Since my appearance last week, Mr. O'Reilly and I have heard from scores of average citizens from across our Nation. Each e-mail, letter or phone agreed on two basic points: first, to protect this country, we must act to address past occurrences of espionage while ensuring that it does not happen in the future; second, we must protect patriots like Colonel Ed McCallum who continues fighting to protect our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the citizens who contacted my office: the security of our Nation is precious.

□ 1915

IT'S TIME TO DECIDE OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week we saw the budget allocation for the Departments of Labor, Health and

Human Services, and Education cut by an additional \$1 billion, making for a potential \$12 billion shortfall in these programs. We saw that same Committee on Appropriations bring to the House floor the FY 2000 defense bill as a level \$10 billion above the 1997 budget agreement cap for defense, and \$5.7 billion above the Administration's request, a request that was already \$1 billion greater than the FY 1999 allocation.

We saw the Republican majority approve a GOP tax bill, mainly for the very wealthy, which would reduce Federal revenues somewhere in the neighborhood of \$800 billion over the next 10 years, and nearly \$3 trillion in the following decade.

What is wrong with this picture? What is wrong is what is missing, funding for our children: for their education, their health and well-being; funding for our seniors: their security, their medicine, and their basic needs; funding for our communities: for their economic development and safety, the protection of open space, safe drinking water, clean air, and the recovery of polluted land.

In a time of unprecedented economic prosperity, I believe we have a unique opportunity to face the issues and solve the problems that have been holding individuals and communities back for decades. We have the resources, if managed carefully, to increase Federal grant assistance for higher education; rebuild our public schools; protect and preserve our national resources; attack poverty and homelessness; clean up contaminated urban sites; invest in environmental, medical, and other technologies; establish early childhood development programs for all our children, and ensure that the health of our children and our seniors is safeguarded for a generation. All we need is the political will to make these choices our national priorities.

In 1997, Congress approved one of the largest tax cuts in the history of our country. We do not need over \$100 billion in new tax breaks for corporations and new favors for the wealthiest Americans when our schools and our communities and infrastructure need significant repair and modernization.

We do not need \$4 billion to \$5 billion worth of pork barrel projects in the defense bill, projects the Pentagon did not ask for and does not want, year after year after year, when that money could reduce classroom size in grades K through 3.

Do not tell me the money is not there. President Clinton presented a budget for the Pentagon that was \$1 billion more than last year's level, increases that will continue annually over the next 6 years. The defense bill approved by the House last week is \$5.7 billion more than even the President's request.

By contrast, according to the Children's Defense Fund, to provide health insurance for every uninsured child in

the United States would cost \$11 billion.

Do not tell me the money is not there. Last week the Republican majority said we can eliminate the estate tax for the 300 largest, wealthiest estates in America, but we cannot provide seniors with the prescription drug benefit. This Congress is deciding the Nation's future, the fate of its children, its seniors, its communities, its farms, without a serious debate on the critical needs and priorities of our Nation.

If the defense budget over the next 5 years includes just the increases requested by President Clinton and the GOP tax bill is implemented, then all other discretionary spending will have to be cut by nearly 40 percent. That is a 40 percent cut in education, in veterans programs, in Head Start, in disaster relief, in urban development, in immunizations for infants and toddlers.

The current budget caps are intolerable if we are to address the current needs of our communities. Is this Congress really prepared to implement a fiscal program that will require an additional 40 percent reduction in all non-defense programs? Does the majority really want this to be the anti-education, anti-children, anti-seniors, anti-veterans Congress, or is it trying to return us to the days of big deficits?

We can do better and we must do better. We are elected to do better. I firmly believe we can have a strong and modern defense second to none without the increases being suggested, but it will require a significant reordering of priorities within the Armed Forces. It will require greater accountability on the part of the Pentagon for the funds it receives. It will require our allies to pay their fair share for global defense. It will also demand restraint and responsibility on the part of all Members of Congress not to load up the defense budget with unneeded and unasked for weapons, equipment, and facilities.

I believe we should provide responsible tax relief to help the most vulnerable in our society become more productive and financially secure, to eliminate the major penalty, to modernize our schools, and enhance our ability to research and develop the technology machinery of the next century.

We have an historic opportunity to address longstanding needs and bring every American into a more prosperous future. I hope we will do that, and not squander this moment with irresponsible spending and reckless tax cuts like the one the Republican majority approved last week.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material relating to the budget.

The material referred to is as follows:

SUMMARY: "WHY A COLD WAR BUDGET WITHOUT A COLD WAR?"

Dr. Lawrence Korb, the former Assistant Secretary of Defense under Ronald Reagan, has outlined an alternative Pentagon budget that would reduce spending by more than

17% per year (\$48 billion). Dr. Korb's study was sponsored by Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities (BLSP), a coalition of business people and military officials who are currently advocating a 15% reduction in the Pentagon budget. They believe this money can be reinvested in programs that build American communities, such as school modernization, class-size reductions, healthcare and other local and state programs. Dr. Korb calls the present Clinton Administration plan "A Cold War Budget without a Cold War" and argues for restructured spending that strengthens the U.S. military in a manner reflective of the drastically changed world order.

INVESTMENT

Dr. Korb's \$75 billion annual modernization proposal (20% less than the present \$94 billion investment budget) would replace aging equipment and increase our technological edge. Dr. Korb's plan would actually modernize U.S. forces "more rapidly at a lower cost" than the current investment strategy. The Pentagon could achieve this by buying less expensive weapons that would still be the most powerful in any battle, rather than building the next generation of unproven weapons at three times the price. "Rushing new generations of weapons systems into production," Dr. Korb reports, "is an antiquated Cold War practice that continues to cost taxpayers billions."

NUCLEAR CAPABILITY

The Korb report calls the \$30 billion spent annually on strategic nuclear forces a remnant of the former U.S./Soviet practice of mutual assured destruction. Dr. Korb urges the U.S. cut the number of strategic nuclear weapons from its present level of 7,500 to a number no greater than 1,000 a quantity large enough to destroy any possible targets but small enough to be maintained at \$15 billion per year (half the present rate).

READINESS

Dr. Korb details a readiness package costing no more than \$145 billion per year, \$21 billion less than present spending (\$166 billion). Dr. Korb's plan would maintain forces capable of winning a major theater war and conduct a significant peacekeeping mission, while maintaining a presence in the other key areas around the globe. Dr. Korb finds that the Pentagon currently overspends in force deployment. He maintains, for example, that stationing 100,000 U.S. troops in Europe is excessive and that 50,000 troops would constitute an effective presence in Europe (which can afford to do more to protect its own interests).

CONCLUSION

Dr. Korb's report stresses the importance of making a Pentagon budget responsive to the reality of the post Cold War world. No longer should the U.S. Government overspend to ensure security or compete in an arms race with the Soviet Union. As the only remaining superpower, it is time for us to adjust spending to reflect that place of privilege and responsibility. Dr. Korb's realistic budget proposals set an important standard for fiscal responsibility. Pentagon officials were immune to financial constraints during the Cold War era, and the recent reviews they have conducted have been, Dr. Korb tells us, "nothing more than a rationalization for the existing force structure." Business Leaders believes that it is now time for the Pentagon to follow Dr. Korb's lead and become accountable for spending taxpayers' assets.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1999]

BUSINESS GETS BIG BREAKS IN TAX BILLS

(By Dan Morgan)

After years of tight budgets and a Congress focused on cutting the deficit, business this

week cashed in on the new economic climate to win billions of dollars in breaks tucked into the tax bill that passed the House and another working its way through the Senate.

Capitalizing on the new era of government surpluses are multinational corporations, utility companies, railroads, oil and gas operators, timber companies, the steel industry and small business owners.

Along with the breaks for those behemoths, smaller provisions sprinkled through the bills will give tax relief to seaplane owners in Alaska, sawmills in Maine, barge lines in Mississippi and investor Warren Buffett. Other provisions assist Eskimo whaling captains on Alaska's North Slope and Carolina woodlot owners.

The House version contains almost \$100 billion in direct tax breaks for business over the next decade—and dozens more provisions that will benefit various industries indirectly. The Senate Finance Committee reported out a different and less generous measure giving business about \$50 billion in direct tax relief.

While special provisions in tax and budget bills are a staple of life in Washington, the difference this time is that, with a projected \$3 trillion budget surplus over the next decade, the lawmakers enjoyed far more flexibility to gratify lobbyists' wishes.

"If you're a business lobbyist and couldn't get into this legislation, you better turn in your six-shooter," said a Democratic lobbyist. "There was that much money around."

The Republican tax plans, which would cut nearly \$800 billion in taxes over the next 10 years, face a long and uncertain road, and are sure to be sharply scaled down before President Clinton will agree to sign them.

Still, the sections providing tax relief for corporations make clear that business intends to use its political muscle to claim its share of the surplus.

Republican leaders strongly defended the tax concessions, saying they are needed to strengthen the competitiveness of U.S. global business, help distressed industries such as steel and oil, and encourage mergers that make the economy more efficient. And they noted that the bulk of tax cuts in the bill go to benefit families.

But some critics—even within the GOP—said the largess to special interests repudiates the party's pledge to eliminate "corporate welfare."

"Republicans promised to change this kind of behavior," said Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), an opponent of "pork barrel" spending. "But I think it's fairly obvious that hasn't been the case. Now we're going to see this big thick tax code on our desks, and the fine print will reveal another cornucopia for the special interests, and a chamber of horrors for the taxpayers."

Tax concessions to the oil and gas industry, as well as nuclear utilities, have also drawn some early fire from environmental and consumer groups.

"At a time when we should be curbing smog and global warming, these bills are going to give billions of dollars in tax breaks to the companies responsible for these problems," said Anna Aurelio, staff scientist at U.S. Public Interest Research Group.

Budget analysts cited a single, sizable item to illustrate how the new budgetary climate has opened up possibilities for corporations.

Since the mid-1980s, multinational corporations have attempted to secure changes in the tax code that would allow them to allocate their worldwide interest deductions in such a way as to generate additional foreign tax credits—and thereby trim their tax bills. The U.S. Treasury has been largely supportive. But according to a lobbyist for a major international bank, "Nobody thought it could get done because it would cost so much money."

This year, both House and Senate bills include the tax relief. The House proposal would cost \$34 billion in lost revenue to the government over the next 10 years, and the

slightly more modest Senate version would cost \$14 billion.

"For so many years Congress was totally focused on raising revenues," said Douglas P. Bates, chief lobbyist for the American Council of Life Insurance. "These were really the first tax bills in a long time where the revenue offsets [the need to find money to make up for cuts elsewhere] weren't driving the issues."

Bates experienced that first-hand. He spent much of the week dispatching a series of e-mail messages to the organization's 500 members, alerting them to beneficial provisions that were added to the bills as they moved through the Senate Finance Committee and the House.

When the dust settled, the full House and Senate committee had approved a series of provisions that had long been on the group's wish list, including deductibility for long-term care insurance and changes in rules governing corporate pension plans. ACLI officials said the changes should create new business for life insurance companies that manage corporate pension plans or offer long-term care coverage.

After years of trying, ACLI also scored a major victory when it got the House to support repeal of a tax provision that delays the ability of life insurance companies to file consolidated returns, or write off losses of newly acquired affiliates against their own profits. The 10-year savings to the industry from that provision alone would be \$949 million, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation.

ACLI Chairman Carroll A. Campbell Jr., a former member of the House Ways and Means Committee, met with committee Chairman Bill Archer (R-Tex.) to press for the change, sources said.

The change is deemed crucial to a wave of insurance company mergers, including the recent one between Provident Insurance Co., of Chattanooga, in the home state of Sen. Fred D. Thompson (R), and UNUM Corp., of Portland, Maine. Thompson, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, persuaded committee Chairman William V. Roth Jr. (R-Del.) to add part of the House provision to his tax draft hours before it was brought before the committee.

ACLI also joined with a coalition of banks and securities firms to get both the full House and Senate Finance Committee to extend for five years a temporary tax deferral on income those industries earn abroad.

The companies, working under the umbrella of the Coalition of Service Industries, will save some \$5 billion in taxes over 10 years as a result of the provision, according to congressional calculations.

As uncertain as the prospects for the across-the-board tax cuts for families are, the tax relief for business seems likely to create its own pressure on Clinton and Congress to agree on legislation. And with tens of millions of dollars in campaign contributions at stake, neither party can afford to ignore business's drive for extensive tax relief this year.

"Business doesn't want a repeat of last year when there was no tax bill, just a bunch of extenders [of provisions about to expire.] It would be nice if this wasn't just a political exercise. There's enough money that I think they can work this out," said John Porter, an Ernst & Young tax expert.

An example of the huge stakes is the more than \$1 billion that the utility industry stands to save in taxes over the next 10 years if a House provision affecting utility mergers survives.

The provision, sponsored by Rep. Gerald "Jerry" Weller (R-Ill.) a Ways and Means Committee member, would excuse the payment of taxes on the fund that utilities set up to cover the costs of shutting down nuclear power plants.

Weller, who has three nuclear facilities in his district, said the tax provision is crucial to the restructuring underway in the utility industry as the nation moves to a deregulated

electricity market. One immediate effect would be to hasten the merger of Decatur, Ill.-based Illinova Corp. and Dynegy Inc., a Houston natural gas company.

The issue, Weller said, was important to the entire Illinois delegation, including House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert (R), though he added he has not spoken to Hastert about the matter.

But some consumer groups are wary. "The nuclear industry has already been getting a ratepayer-funded bailout in state electricity reorganization plans. Now they're going for federal tax breaks too," said U.S. Public Interest Research Group's Aurelio.

Several environmental groups this week said they were still studying provisions in both the House and Senate versions of the bill that would allow timber companies to write off the cost of replanting trees over seven years, rather than recovering those costs when they sold the trees.

"We see this as a huge win for the environment," said Michael Kelin of the American Forest and Paper Association, which lobbied Rep. Jennifer Dunn (R-Wash.) and other timber state members. "This will lead to a greener America."

THE BIG WINNERS

Big Business: Relaxation of pension and health plan regulations; bills also lift some ceilings on defined pension benefits.

Expanded availability of foreign tax credits, by allowing global allocation of interest deductions (both bills).

Small Business: Repeal or reduction of estate taxes (both bills).

House restores 80 percent deductibility of business meals.

Banks, securities firms: Bills extend ability to defer taxes on income earned abroad until money is returned home.

Railroads, barge lines: both bills repeal 4.3 cents per gallon tax on rail diesel and barge fuels.

Timber: House reduces capital gain on sale of trees. Both bills allow seven-year amortization of costs of replanting trees, lifting current cap.

Insurance: House bill would end five-year restriction against life insurance companies writing off losses of affiliates against profits. House and Senate allow deductibility of long-term care insurance.

Oil and Gas: House bill allows expensing of environmental remediation costs; expands net operating loss carryback to five years; extends suspension of income limits on percentage depletion allowance.

Utilities: In utility mergers, the House bill allows acquiring companies not to pay tax on funds previously set aside to cover future costs of decommissioning nuclear plants.

Steel: House allows manufacturers to use alternative minimum tax credit carryover to reduce 90 percent of AMT liability.

PRIORITIES

1. Amount of federal tax money allocated to the Pentagon this year: \$276 billion.

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4 Budget of the United States (FY 2000); 5, 6, 7, 8 Center for Defense Information (Washington, DC); 9 World Military and Social Expenditures by Ruth Leger Sivard; 10 National Center for Educational Statistics (Washington, DC); 11, 12, Children's Defense Fund (Washington, DC); 13 Budget of the United States (FY 2000); 14 Children's Defense Fund (Washington, DC); 15 Council for a Liveable World Education Fund (Washington, DC); 16 U.S. Conference of Mayors (Washington, DC); 17 Center for Defense Information (Washington, DC); 18 Justice Policy Institute (Washington, DC); 19, 20 Budget of the United States (FY 2000); 21, 22 "A \$75 set screw? Bad old days of Pentagon purchasing are back," Copley News Service, by Julia Malone, March 18, 1998; 23 Center for Defense Information (Washington, DC); 24 World Military and Social Expenditures by Ruth Leger Sivard; 25, 26 SIPRI (Stockholm); 27, 28 Center for Responsive Politics (Washington, DC); 29, 30 distributed anonymously over the Internet; 31 "Military-Industrial Complex Revisited," by William Hartung, World Policy Institute, November, 1998; 32 \$276 billion annual Pentagon budget ÷ 365 days per year ÷ 24 hours per day ÷ 60 minutes per hour = 2 minutes = \$1,050,200.

2. Amount allocated to education: \$31 billion.

3. Amount allocated to the Environmental Protection Agency: \$7 billion.

4. Amount allocated to Head Start: \$5 billion.

5. Ratio of U.S. defense spending versus Iraqi defense spending: 276 to 1.

6. Ratio of Pentagon spending to combined defense spending of Russia, China, and all "rogue" nations: 2 to 1.

7. Ratio of defense spending by U.S. and allies to combined defense spending by those nations: 4 to 1.

8. Rank of U.S. military spending among all nations: 1.

9. Rank of U.S. education spending per student among all nations: 10.

10. Rank of math and science test scores by U.S. high school students among industrialized nations: 18.

11. Number of children without health insurance in U.S.: 11 million.

12. Number of children without health insurance in all other industrialized nations: 0.

13. Amount of President Clinton's proposed increase to the Pentagon budget next year: \$12 billion.

14. Amount needed to provide health insurance for 11 million American kids who don't have it: \$11 billion.

15. Amount of pork in the Pentagon budget—not requested by the Pentagon but inserted by Congress: \$5 billion.

16. Amount needed to reduce kindergarten through third grade class size to 18 students: \$4 billion.

17. Amount required to build 48 of 341 new F-22 fighters, designed to fight the collapsed Soviet Union: \$9 billion.

18. Amount needed to provide proven anti-crime programs for all eligible kids in U.S.: \$9 billion.

19. Percentage of U.S. discretionary budget—the part of the budget that Congress votes on—given to Pentagon: 48.

20. Percentage allocated to education: 8.

21. Amount paid by the Pentagon for one screw in 1998: \$75.

22. Amount such a screw would cost in a hardware store: 50 cents.

23. Rank of U.S. nuclear arsenal among all nations: 1.

24. Rank of U.S. infant mortality rate among all nations: 13.

25. Percentage decrease in Russian defense budget since 1998: 74.

26. Percentage decrease in Pentagon budget since 1998: 21.

27. Amount of political contributions and lobbying in 1997 by tobacco industry: \$44 million.

28. By the weapons industry: \$58 million.

29. Cost of a New Attack Submarine, proposed to replace U.S. subs that are already the world's best: \$2.1 billion.

30. Cost of one decent map of downtown Belgrade: priceless.

31. Percentage of Senators who have a facility in their district owned by defense contractor Lockheed Martin: 100.

32. Amount spent by Pentagon while you read this fact sheet (average reading time 2 minutes): \$1 million.

[From the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, July 12, 1999]

MUCH OF THE PROJECTED NON-SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS IS A MIRAGE

MAJORITY OF SURPLUS RESTS ON ASSUMPTIONS OF DEEP CUTS IN DOMESTIC PROGRAMS THAT ARE UNLIKELY TO OCCUR

(By Sam Elkin and Robert Greenstein)

Congressional Budget Office figures released July 1 indicate that the large majority of the budget surplus projected outside Social Security is essentially artificial because it depends on unrealistic assumptions that large, unspecified cuts will be made over the next 10 years in appropriated programs and that there will be no emergency expenditures over this period. When the more realistic assumption is made that total non-emergency expenditures for appropriated programs will neither be cut nor increased and will simply stay even with inflation—and that emergency expenditures will continue at their 1991–1998 average level—nearly 90 percent of the projected non-Social Security surplus disappears.¹

The new CBO projections show that under current law, the federal government will begin running surpluses in the non-Social Security budget in fiscal year 2000 and run cumulative non-Social Security surpluses of \$996 billion over the next 10 years. But these projections, like those OMB issued several days earlier assume that total expenditures for appropriated programs—which include the vast bulk of defense expenditures—will remain within the austere and politically unrealistic "caps" the 1997 budget law set on appropriated programs.²

To remain within the FY 2000 caps will entail cutting appropriated (i.e., discretionary) programs billions of dollars below the FY 1999 level. No one expects this to occur. Leaders of both parties have acknowledged that a number of appropriations bills cannot pass unless the amount of funding provided for the bills is at significantly higher levels than the current caps allow.

The caps for FY 2001 and 2002 are more unrealistic than the FY 2000 cap; the caps for those years are significantly lower than the FY 2000 cap when inflation is taken into account. Moreover, the CBO and OMB projections assume that for years after 2002, total expenditures for appropriated programs will remain at the level of the severe cap for FY 2002, adjusted only for inflation in years after FY 2002. This means that the surplus projections assume levels of expenditures for appropriated programs for fiscal years 2001 through 2009 that are lower, when inflation is taken into account, than the highly unrealistic FY 2000 cap that almost certainly will not be met.

Also of note, both parties have proposed significant increases in defense spending in coming years. Defense spending constitutes about half of overall expenditures for appropriated programs. In addition, legislation enacted last year requires increases in highway spending in coming years. These factors are further reasons why the caps are unlikely to be sustained.

CBO must base its budget projections on current law. The spending caps on appro-

riated programs are current law. CBO has acted properly in developing its projections. But policymakers who act as though the \$1 trillion in non-Social Security surpluses projected over the next 10 years all represent new funds that can go for tax cuts of program expansions appear to misunderstand the meaning of the projections.

Because the CBO projections rest on the assumption that expenditures for appropriated programs will be held to the levels of the caps, these projections assume that over the next 10 years, these expenditures will be reduced \$595 billion below current (i.e., FY 1999) levels of non-emergency discretionary spending, adjusted for inflation. (The \$595 billion figure is found in a CBO table on this matter issued July 12.)

Since defense spending is widely expected to rise, all of these \$595 billion in cuts would have to come from non-defense programs, primarily domestic programs. This would entail reducing overall expenditures for on-defense appropriated programs by 15 percent to 20 percent over the next 10 years, after adjusting for inflation. Since some areas of non-defense spending such as highways are slated to increase, other areas would need to be cut deeper than 15 percent to 20 percent. Achieving cuts of this magnitude in non-defense appropriated programs would be unprecedented.

Cutting federal expenditures results in lower levels of debt. CBO projects that the \$595 billion in reductions in appropriated programs assumed in its baseline would generate \$154 billion in additional savings over the next 10 years through lower interest payments on the debt. Consequently, the reductions in appropriated programs that the CBO projections assume result in total savings of \$749 billion over the next 10 years.

These \$749 billion in assumed savings account for 75 percent—or three-fourths—of the non-Social Security surplus projected over the next 10 years. Since most or all of these cuts are unlikely to materialize, a large majority of the surplus projected in the non-Social Security budget is essentially a mirage.

EMERGENCY SPENDING

Nor does this represent the full extent to which the DBO projections rest on assumptions that lead to an overstatement of the likely non-Social Security surplus. The CBO projections assume no emergency spending for the next 10 years. There will, of course, be emergencies over the next 10 years that result in government expenditures. There have been emergency expenditures outside the spending caps every year since the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 established the caps. Hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and international emergencies will not magically disappear.

Over the 1990's, emergency funding has averaged \$8 billion a year, excluding both emergency expenditures for Desert Storm in the early 1990s and the higher level of emergency spending in fiscal year 1999.³ The most prudent assumption to make is that emergency expenditures will continue to average about \$8 billion a year.

This means an additional \$80 billion of the projected surplus over the next 10 years is not likely to materialize since it will be used for emergency expenditures. This \$80 billion in expenditures will cause interest payments on the debt to be \$24 billion higher than the levels the CBO projections assume.

¹We use the average level of emergency spending in fiscal years 1991 through 1998, other than expenditures for Desert Storm. This also excludes the high level of emergency spending in fiscal year 1999. The term "appropriated programs," as used here, means discretionary programs.

²Technically, OMB assumes expenditures for discretionary programs that exceed the caps, but it also assumes offsetting reductions in mandatory programs and tax increases.

³The \$8 billion figure represents average funding for emergencies other than Desert Storm for fiscal years 1991 through 1998, as expressed in 1999 dollars.

ESTIMATE OF AVAILABLE SURPLUS LOWER THAN
IN EARLIER CENTER ANALYSES

Based on Congressional Budget Office data, this analysis shows that when realistic assumptions are used, the non-Social Security surpluses total only about \$112 billion over the next 10 years. Earlier Center versions of this analysis showed modestly larger available surpluses. The revisions in this analysis stem from two factors. First, on July 12, the Congressional Budget Office issued a table that raised CBO's estimate of the portion of the CBO surplus projection that results from the assumption that discretionary spending will be cut. CBO had earlier estimated that \$584 billion of the projected surplus was attributable to assuming that non-emergency discretionary spending would be reduced below the FY 1999 level of non-emergency discretionary expenditures, adjusted for inflation. CBO now estimates that \$595 billion of the surplus projection is due to this assumption. Second, an earlier Center analysis did not address the assumption in the CBO projections that there would be no emergency expenditures for the next 10 years. This revised Center analysis does address this matter.

CBO'S SURPLUS FORECAST: HOW MUCH IS REALLY
AVAILABLE FOR TAX CUTS AND PROGRAM EXPANSIONS?

(In billion of dollars)

CBO projection of non-Social Security surplus over 10 years	\$996
Amount needed to keep non-emergency spending for appropriated programs even with inflation	-595
Likely emergency expenditures (based on average annual emergency expenditures, FY 1991-1998)	-80
Social Security administrative costs (CBO counts as a Social Security expenditure, but Congress counts as a non-Social Security expenditure)	-31
Higher interest payments on debt due to higher levels of spending for appropriated programs than the CBO projections assume	-178
Remaining surplus available for other uses (if some of this is used for tax cuts or program expansions, interest payments will rise further above the CBO projection, requiring some of the \$112 billion to be used for interest costs)	

CONGRESSIONAL AND CLINTON BUDGETARY
TREATMENT OF SPENDING FOR APPROPRIATED
PROGRAMS

The Congressional budget resolution approved earlier this year assumes a very large tax cut of \$778 billion over 10 years. The resolution can accommodate a tax cut of this magnitude because it assumes that none of the surplus will go to placing spending for appropriated programs at a more realistic level. Moreover, the budget resolution assumes that additional cuts in appropriated programs of nearly \$200 billion over 10 years will be instituted, on top of the already unrealistic reductions assumed in CBO's projections. (These additional reductions would come in years after 2002.) Under the budget resolution, overall expenditures for non-defense appropriated programs would be cut 29 percent between FY 1999 and FY 2009, after adjusting for inflation.

The Clinton budget would add back somewhere in the vicinity of \$500 billion over 10 years for appropriated programs, or most of the \$595 billion needed to keep non-emergency spending for appropriated programs even with inflation. The Clinton budget only uses \$328 billion of the surplus, however, for this purpose. The remaining funds would be raised through a series of offsetting cuts in entitlement programs and tax increases, such as a cigarette tax increase. Many, if not most, of these offsets are given little chance of passage on Capitol Hill. If these offsets are not approved and no funds from the surplus are provided for appropriated programs beyond the \$328 billion the Administration has proposed, appropriated programs would have to be cut approximately \$270 billion over 10 years below current levels, adjusted for inflation. (To compute the exact amount ap-

propriated programs would have to be reduced under this scenario requires data not yet available on the Administration's new budget plans.) In addition, the Administration's budget does not appear to reserve a portion of the surplus for the emergency expenditures that inevitably will occur.

Another \$31 billion also must be subtracted from the project non-Social Security surplus; it is needed for the administrative costs of operating Social Security. As the Congressional Budget Office explains on page 6 of its new report, CBO counts these \$31 billion in costs as a Social Security expenditures, but Congress treats them as part of the non-Social Security budget and counts them against the spending caps on discretionary programs. (The Congressional budget resolutions passed each year include these expenditures as non-Social Security expenditures that affect the size of the non-Social Security surplus. It is the budget resolution, not the CBO projections, that Congressional budget rules enforce.) Counting these costs as part of the non-Social Security budget reduces the non-Social Security surplus.

When this \$135 billion—\$80 billion for emergency expenditures, \$24 billion for related interest payments on the debt, and \$31 billion for Social Security administrative costs—is added to the \$749 billion described above in expenditures for appropriated programs and related interest payments on the debt, a total of \$884 billion—89 percent of the projected non-Social Security surplus—dries up. Only \$112 billion remains. (See table on page 3.) In addition, non-Social Security surpluses of any size do not appear until 2006; the non-Social Security budget either continues to show deficits or is in balance (but without significant surpluses) until that time.

One other caution regarding the surplus projections should be noted. The economic and technical assumptions underlying the forecast could prove too rosy (or not rosy enough). CBO has repeatedly warned that a high degree of uncertainty attaches to budget projections made several years in advance. In a report issued earlier this year, CBO noted that if its projections for fiscal year 2004 prove to miss the mark by the average percentage amount that CBO projections made five years in advance have provided to be off over the past decade, its surplus forecast for 2004 will be off by \$250 billion.⁴ If economic growth is modestly slower than forecast or health care costs rise substantially faster than is currently projected, budget surplus could be substantially lower than those reflected in the CBO estimates.

HOW MUCH OF THE SURPLUS IS AVAILABLE FOR
TAX CUTS, MEDICARE, AND SOCIAL SECURITY
IF MORE REALISTIC ASSUMPTIONS ARE USED?

In summary, if more realistic assumptions are used—namely, that total non-emergency expenditures for discretionary programs will remain at the fiscal year 1999 level, adjusted for inflation and emergency spending will remain at its average level for the recent past—a very different picture emerges of how much in surplus funds is available for tax cuts, shoring up Medicare and Social Security, and other initiatives. Under this more plausible scenario, only about \$112 billion remains available, and hardly any of it is available in the next five years.⁵

⁴In computing the average percentage amount by which CBO projections made five years in advance have proven to be off, CBO excluded the effects of legislation on deficits or surpluses. The \$250 billion figure is based on the average percentage amount by which the budget projections missed the mark due solely to economic and technical factors. See CBO, *The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal years 2000-2009*, January 1999, p. xxiii.

⁵There would be a small non-Social Security surplus in fiscal year 2002.

It may be noted that to assume, as we do here, that total non-emergency expenditures for appropriated programs will be no higher in future years than non-emergency expenditures for such programs in fiscal year 1999, adjusted for inflation, is to use a conservative assumption. It is a foregone conclusion that defense spending will rise faster than inflation. Hence, for overall non-emergency expenditures for appropriated programs to remain even with inflation, non-defense programs must be cut in real (i.e., inflation-adjusted) dollars. Yet spending for some non-defense program areas such as highways is already slated to rise. The House recently passed legislation to boost aviation spending as well. Thus, the assumption used here for expenditures for appropriated programs may be too low.

These findings have major implications for policymakers. For there to be sufficient surplus funds to finance the large tax cuts some policymakers advocate, Congress would have to make cuts of unprecedented depth in appropriated programs over the next 10 years—cuts substantially deeper than those policymakers are balking at passing this year.

TRENDS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

Expenditures for appropriated (i.e., discretionary) programs are already low in historical terms as a percentage of GDP. There is serious question about how much further they can be expected to decline.

CBO projects that total discretionary spending will equal 6.5 percent of GDP in fiscal year 1999, the lowest level since at least 1962. (Published data on discretionary spending as a share of GDP only go back to 1962.)

Much of the decline in discretionary spending as a share of GDP has come in defense spending, which fell following the end of the Cold War. But non-defense discretionary spending also has contracted as a share of GDP. At 3.4 percent of GDP this year and last, non-defense discretionary spending is at as low or lower a share of GDP as in any year since 1962.

Under the new budget projections, discretionary spending would fall much further as a percentage of GDP. The new CBO projections assume discretionary spending will fall from 6.5 percent of GDP today to 5.0 percent in 2009, as much lower level than in any year in decades.

Discretionary spending may be approaching its limits in terms of how much more it can fall as a share of GDP. That may be one of the lessons both of last year's highway bill and of last October's omnibus appropriations bill, which exceed the budget limits for discretionary spending and designated the overage as emergency spending.

While non-defense discretionary spending has fallen over the past several decades as a share of GDP, it has not declined in inflation-adjusted terms (although it has declined since 1980 if an adjustment reflecting the increase in the size of the U.S. population is made as well). If we have emerged from a period of deficits without expenditures for non-defense discretionary programs having declined in inflation-adjusted terms, there is little reason to believe the political system will exact deep cuts in this part of the budget when the outlook is sunny, surpluses have merged, and pent-up demands for various types of discretionary spending are coming to the fore (witness the aviation bill the House recently approved). This underscores the unrealistic nature of the assumptions of substantial reductions in discretionary program expenditures that underlie the projections of \$1 trillion non-Social Security surpluses.

THE DISASTROUS STATE OF AGRICULTURE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here today. I do have the high honor of representing the Seventh District of Tennessee. Both that district and the State itself has a very strong and diverse economy.

Included as part of the base of that economy is agriculture, and as I would follow on the heels of my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), his statements, our agriculture in Tennessee and in this country is in a disastrous state, something that we ought to all be concerned with here in Congress. As we work to satisfy the number of issues that are out there that cover the board, we cannot forget about agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I have had several meetings in my district where I talked to different constituencies, and that is a consistent complaint that we hear; that while we are doing well in our industries, our manufacturing, our distribution across the State, the agricultural communities, not only the farmers and beef producers, the pork producers, but the communities in which they live, the banks, the equipment dealers, the stores, the retailers, are all suffering along with them.

I have been told that in effect what is happening in the agricultural communities is that they are being paid 1950s prices, but yet their expenses are 1999 expenses today. I would challenge any part of our economy to operate under those standards, that you are getting paid like you were in 1950, but your expenses are today's expenses. You cannot exist very long in that type of situation.

When we came to Congress in 1994, we did a lot of good things. One of the good things we did was try to turn our farmers loose to compete like everybody else; to lift up all the programs and restraints that they had and to let them compete in this world market, this global market that we are in.

One of the commitments we made to these farmers, in addition to lifting these restraints and saying, you are on your own, go out and do the best you can, one of the conditions we laid out was that we will help you with the estate tax.

Despite what the previous speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, said, this tax bill that we passed last week does wonderful things for our farmers. It does in fact help them with the estate tax. When the family farm can be passed along with less estate tax being paid, it is more likely that the heirs, the children of that farmer, will be able to keep that family farm.

I would suggest that this bill we passed last week, this tax reform, goes to more than just 300 of the richest Americans out there, it goes to our

farm owners, our small businesses in our smaller communities.

Another thing that we did in that tax bill was help our farmers through self-insured insurance. When they buy their own insurance, they can deduct that total premium for that. This 10 percent across-the-board tax break, this applies to farmers, also.

One of the other requirements that we promised them back when we lifted the programs was that we would help them in our markets, help them stabilize their markets. When they raise all their crops, have the good years, when they win the battle over the droughts and too much rain and bugs and pests that come out to destroy their crops, they still have to sell those crops somewhere. We promised them we would help stabilize the markets.

I would simply ask my colleagues, every time that we have an opportunity to vote on these kinds of issues that pertain to boycotts and embargoes against other countries, particularly as they deal with food and fiber, that we be careful there that we do not always do that at the blink of an eye.

Another commitment we made to our farmers was regulatory relief. We said we would make it easier for them to farm, and yet, we hear stories in committees that I sit in about the Environmental Protection Agency coming in and wanting to take away some of the chemicals that our farmers use to be able to be as successful as they are in producing basically the food for the world.

Now we are being told that maybe they cannot use some of these chemicals, or that some of their land may be a wetland and that it ought to be in a position where they cannot use it to farm. They pay taxes on it, they own it, but they cannot farm it.

I am simply saying that our farmers are the best stewards of the lands that we have. They have to be good stewards. They have to be environmentalists. They want to take care of the land because it is their source of living. There are not any better stewards of land out there than the farmers.

I would remind my colleagues that when we get into these kinds of issues, I would ask that we remember our farmers. We have to keep them in mind. A lot of people seem to think, and I say this jokingly, though, that the food starts in the grocery store, and that the fiber or clothing that we buy starts in the department stores. They do not think anything about what causes that to appear in the stores. They simply think it is there when they go buy something, and it will always be there. But we have to keep our farmers in mind as we deal with the panoply of legislation that we deal with.

I simply use my 5 minutes of time this afternoon to remind my colleagues of the importance of our agricultural communities.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL SPENDING PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about national priorities and Federal budget needs. It is now estimated that the budget surpluses over the next 10 years, not counting social security surpluses, will be a little under \$1 trillion. Now everyone in Washington wants to figure out how to spend that \$1 trillion.

Last week we saw the Republican plan for that money. Last week the House of Representatives passed a bill to use almost the entire surpluses, \$792 billion of the projected \$966 billion surpluses for the next 10 years, for a tax cut, a tax cut heavily slanted to the rich, a tax cut in which 1 percent of taxpayers will get 30 percent of the tax relief, and a tax cut that is back end loaded and will cost an additional \$2 trillion in revenues in the second 10 years, just when the baby boomers will be retiring and necessitating huge new expenditures for social security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives also passed the defense appropriations bill, which will spend \$266 billion for defense programs, \$2.8 billion more than the administration requested. When combined with other military spending bills, the total defense spending will be \$288 billion this year, about \$8 billion more than the President's request and almost \$10 billion more than the cap set by the 1997 Balanced Budget Act.

Thankfully, that bill did not include funding to purchase the Rolls Royce of the sky, the F-22 jet fighter. There is still a very real danger the funding for the F-22 will be restored in conference. That would be a huge mistake. For the price of each F-22 plane at \$200 million per plane, it will be too expensive to risk in combat. For each F-22, you could repair 117 American schools, you could build 33 new elementary schools, or enroll 40,000 more children in Head Start. Is that not a better use of taxpayer funds?

However, when Congress cut the F-22, it did not use the funds for schools or children, it used the funds for more defense spending. Members of Congress cannot wait to bust the budget caps and spend millions more for defense, but we have not done the same for domestic social programs. We all know every penny we spend on the military will not be available to strengthen social security, build affordable housing, extend health care coverage to millions of Americans, or pay down the national debt, and yet we are still talking about devastating cuts to vital Federal programs, included social security.

The surplus we hear so much about is based on the assumption that most domestic programs will be cut far past the bone. Simply providing enough funding for non-defense discretionary

programs to keep pace with inflation would require an additional \$590 billion over the next 10 years.

Factoring in an allowance for the average level of emergency appropriations would require another \$100 billion. If these limited funds are spent instead on the Republican tax cut, it would mean an average 27 percent cut in all domestic programs by 2009.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981, President Reagan and the Republicans led us over the edge of a cliff. They thought we could have a large tax cut and increase defense spending. Sound familiar? The result was an increase in our national debt, the accumulated deficits since George Washington, from \$800 billion in 1981, when Ronald Reagan took office, to \$4.3 trillion in 1993 when Bill Clinton was sworn in.

□ 1930

In 1992, the deficit was \$290 billion, with annual deficits of \$500 billion projected for the mid-1990's. The Clinton deficit reduction plan of 1993, passed without a single Republican vote, began our climb out of the abyss. Now after 7 years of strong economic growth and careful management of government resources, including reduction of the Federal work force of 370,000, we have reached high ground.

We balanced budgets and projected surpluses, and this pains our Republican colleagues. They do not want either to pay down the national debt, as the President proposes, or to initiate long-postponed investments in our schools and day-care centers and our cities and our colleges, our Medicare, and Head Start.

We ought to invest this money, instead, in our people, in our schools, and our infrastructure in order to keep our economy growing. With the strong robust economy, we can meet the needs facing Social Security while we invest in other social programs to improve the lives of all Americans.

So the message is clear tonight. We cannot postpone any longer our long-postponed investments in schools and day-care centers and roads and bridges and railroads and Medicare and Head Start and housing. Now is the time to shift budget priorities to reflect future needs to help working families to have an educated work force, to build up our country's infrastructure so that we can keep economic growth at a high level that will generate the money to pay for it and that will pay for the money to pay for the Medicare and for Social Security as our baby boomers start to retire.

Let us not fritter this away on a tax cut for the rich and on unneeded defense spending on unneeded Rolls Royce programs.

TRIBUTE TO KOREAN WAR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama

(Mr. BACHUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 46th anniversary of the end of the Korean War. So I think it is a fitting time to remember and pay tribute to all Americans who fought and died in that war.

Yesterday, I had the privilege of speaking at a Korean War Memorial Service in Fultondale, Alabama. There, the names of 672 Alabamans, who died or are missing in action in that war, names were called. It was a very emotional service. We had a 21-gun salute. Relatives placed flowers at the memorial.

I gave a speech, and the veterans at that memorial asked me to again give that speech tonight in tribute to their fallen comrades and to all of those who served in Korea, those who died, and the 8,000 who are still missing in action as a result of that war.

I will place in the RECORD the names of those 672 Alabamans who paid it all in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the Bible, God calls on his people, on his children to remember, to remember the wonderful works that he has done, to remember his miracles, to remember all that he has done for them.

When we read the Bible, we are sometimes frustrated that the children of Israel continually forgot the good things that God had done for them. We sometimes say why were they so unappreciative? Why did they forget? Why did they fail to remember?

But are we so different? Is not our treatment and our ignorance of the Korean War not a parallel? We forgot a whole war and the sacrifices made there. Why did we forget? Why were we so unappreciative for the 37,000 Americans who died there? Why do we not know a lot about that or the fact there are 8,000 missing to this day?

The Korean War was concluded, not with the enemy's surrender, but with a negotiated armistice that reestablished the existing borders between North and South Korea. It left an uneasy peace that exists even today.

With tens of thousands of young Americans brutally killed and a war occurring in such a remote and inhospitable land so far away with no victory to celebrate, the Korean War gave most Americans little to remember and much to forget.

For that reason, the Korean War is today called the "Forgotten War," and it is often spoken of as the Forgotten War. However, there is much to remember about this war, much to remember about those who left farms and factories, high school classrooms and college campuses to defend our freedom.

From Alabama, there were four brothers, the Goodwin brothers. They all survived Korea. They came home with eight purple hearts. Mr. Goodwin, Bob Goodwin from Birmingham, was there yesterday to lay flowers at the memorial.

Today, we recall, and we remember. We are not here to cheer or to celebrate, but to reflect on the sacrifices that were made so long ago, to remember the living, those who survived and are not here today, and those who died and lie buried about us and those, as I said, 8,000 whose bodies were never recovered, who were never buried here in the United States.

World War II had followed World War I, the war to end all wars. The long struggle against Nazism and imperialism was over, and America, although victorious, was so weary of war. America and her people knew well the cost, the horror, and the sacrifice of war.

But that did not prevent 1½ million of America's finest patriots from leaving their homes or friends to serve. Halfway around the world they went or, as so aptly described in the Korean War Memorial, to "a place they had never been and a people they had never met."

As William Sessions, the father of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), said, "They went not for conquest and not for gain, but only to protect the anguished and the innocent. They suffered greatly and by their heroism in a thousand forgotten battles they added a luster to the codes we hold most dear: duty, honor, country, fidelity, bravery, and integrity."

These were citizen soldiers. But for the most part, they were not skilled in war. They were ordinary young men and women like our sons and daughters.

We should remember, too, the hardships our Korean War veterans endured: the deadly cold, the weeks and months spent crammed in foxholes and bunkers dug into rugged, harsh terrain. They faced an enemy of overwhelming numbers ready to torture and brutalize. They were locked in hand-to-hand combat at "Heartbreak Ridge" and "Pork Chop Hill," confronted with the fastest fighter jets at "Mig Alley."

Today's military history records that our Korean veterans set a standard of courage that may be matched, but which will never be surpassed.

In summary, chiseled in silver on the Korean War Memorial are the words "Freedom is not free." The men and women who served in Korea and the family and friends of those 37,000 who never returned and those thousands still missing have paid it all. They demonstrate the high and precious cost of freedom.

We should never forget that these patriots paid a price one by one when they were swept away by the treacherous tides of Inchon or died defending the perimeter of Pusan or froze to death by the hundreds at Choson reservoir or in the long march back. Their families will never forget their sacrifice and neither should we.

Now on this hot sunny, summer day, Mr. Speaker, let me simply sum up by saying, today we know that those, that first resolute action by these veterans

stemmed the expansion of communism and, in so doing, helped change the course of history.

Now, we know it took four more decades to win the battle against com-

munist. But having witnessed the collapse of the Berlin Wall and its aftermath, we know now that those who served in Korea laid the foundation for one of the greatest victories in the his-

tory of mankind, the free world triumph over communism.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the names of the Alabamians who died in the Korean War as follows:

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED)¹

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County ²	State
Abercrombie, Aaron R.	1LT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Adams, Aubrey G.	PVT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Adams, Bernard B.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Adams, John R.	SFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Adams, Robert E.	MSGT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Albright, Richard V.	PFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Aldridge, Ellis L.	SFC	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Alexander, Howard E.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Alford, Ottis F.	CPL	Army	Morgan	Alabama
Allen, Alonzo	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Allen, James R.	PVT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Allums, Morris	SFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Alverson, R. C.	SGT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Anderson, Lloyd G.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Andrews, Earnest M.	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Ange, Luther M.	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Anthony, Stanley H.	PVT	Army	Chambers	Alabama
Arceneaux, Harry A.	SGT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Archer, B. R.	PFC	Army	St. Clair	Alabama
Arnold, Bloyce C.	SGT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Arrington, Andrew B.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Atherton, Harold J.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Atwood, Virgil M.	2LT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Bailey, Charles	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Bailey, James J.	PFC	Army	St. Clair	Alabama
Bailey, Raymond E.	CPL	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Bailey, Willard E.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Bain, Odom Carl	CPL	Marines	Town Creek	Alabama
Baker, Isaac E.	SFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Baker, Steward M., Jr.	2LT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Ball, James H.	PFC	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Barfield, David D.	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Barker, William A.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Barnes, Mack R.	SFC	Army	Henry	Alabama
Barnett, Robert A.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Barrier, James F.	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Bates, Elmore C.	SFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Bates, William A.	PFC	Marines	Vinemont	Alabama
Beams, Charles L.	CPL	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Beasley, John A.	PFC	Army	Marion	Alabama
Beason, Howard Eugene	CPL	Marines	Walnut Grove	Alabama
Benefield, Denson H.	PVT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Betts, Charles C., Sr.	SGT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Beveridge, Bruce, Jr.	2LT	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Bill, Hubert L.	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Birchfield, Edward	CPL	Army	Madison	Alabama
Bird, James P.	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Bishop, Travis A.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Bishop, Wesley W., Jr.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Black, Paul Eugene	PFC	Marines	Centre	Alabama
Blanks, Willie F.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Blenkinsap, John R.	CPL	Army	Walker	Alabama
Bolton, George D.	PVT	Army	Pickens	Alabama
Booker, Robert L.	SFC	Army	Consoch	Alabama
Boone, Boyce J.	1LT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Booth, Izea	PVT	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Bowen, Elzie R.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Bowers, Jefferson A.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Bowlin, Milas E.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Bracknell, Arthur	CPL	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Braden, Robert D.	PFC	Army	Coosa	Alabama
Brannon Wilmer	CPL	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Braswell, Carl W.	CPL	Marines	Childersburg	Alabama
Briers, Charlie	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Brim, Zephy	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Bringhurst, Robert	SGT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Brooks, Charles E.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Brooks, John W. Jr.	PVT	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Brooks, Leotis	PFC	Army	Barbour	Alabama
Brooks, Lloyd K.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Brown, Buford M.	PFC	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Brown, Walter Jr.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Brown, William E.	1LT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Browning, Joseph D.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Browning, Perry H.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Brozell, Albert M.	CPL	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Bruce, Ralph T.	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Bryant, Vivian D.	SGT	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Burch, Louie F.	SGT	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Burgitt, Alfred T.	CPL	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Burney, Ralston L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Burt, John E.	SGT	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Bush, Billy J.	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Byrd, Ervin A.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Caldwell, Crayton Lowell	CPL	Marines	Wadley	Alabama
Calhoun, Harold	CPL	Army	Chambers	Alabama
Callaway, Vernon A.	PVT	Army	Bount	Alabama
Cameron, Floyd D.	PFC	Marines	Notasulga	Alabama
Campbell, Charlie A.	SFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Caraway, Cody E.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Carroll, James R.	CPL	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Carter, Dudley	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Carter, Emmett J.	CPL	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Cash, James R.	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Castle, William B.	SGT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Causey, Billy J.	PVT	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Cauthen, Winifred	PVT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Champion, Merrill A.	PFC	Army	Cleburne	Alabama
Chancery, Joseph D.	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Chancey, Howard Harrell	PFC	Marines	Ariton	Alabama
Chapman, Harold S.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED)¹—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County ²	State
Chappell, Billie F.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Christian, Earl E.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Clark, Charles W.	CPL	Army	Lee	Alabama
Clark, O. C. Jr.	PVT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Clark, Odell	SGT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Clements, Louis C.	PVT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Clements, Terrell C.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Cleveland, Clifton	PFC	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Cleveland, Euclid, L.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Cleveland, Ned J.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Clyott, Cecil Harrison Jr.	1LT	Air Force	Talladega	Alabama
Coates, Roman W.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Cobb, William L.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Cochran, Jack D.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Cochran, L. G.	PFC	Army	Marion	Alabama
Cody, George G.	CAPT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Coffman, Emory Ronald	LCDR	Army	Elkmont	Alabama
Coker, Cecil A.	PFC	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Coker, Martin A.	CAPT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Cole, Phillip M.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Coleman, Herbert	SFC	Army	Hale	Alabama
Collier, Rogers	1LT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Collins, Harry P.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Cook, Thomas H.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Cork, Thomas R.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Cornell, Paul D.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Cotney, Comer C.	PVT	Army	Tallapoosa	Alabama
Counts, George W.	SGT	Army	Colbert	Alabama
Cox, Arthur W.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Cox, James A.	PFC	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Crabtree, Morgan L.	SGT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Craig, Willie	PFC	Army	Dallas	Alabama
Creel, William T.	CPL	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Crocker, George A.	PFC	Marines	Gadsden	Alabama
Crockett, Charles R.	CPL	Marines	Sheffield	Alabama
Crowder, Donald G.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Crumpton, Floyd T.	PVT	Army	Morgan	Alabama
Culpepper, Lonnie	SGT	Army	St. Clair	Alabama
Cummings, Charlie W.	PFC	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Cunningham, Augustu	PFC	Army	Dallas	Alabama
Cunningham, Luther	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Daniels, Judge	PVT	Army	Henry	Alabama
Dates, Little N.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Daughtry, Charles E.	CPL	Army	Lee	Alabama
Davidson, Gerald E.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Davis, Arnold G., Sr.	SGT	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Davis, Billie Howard	PFC	Marines	Phoenixville	Alabama
Davis, Claude L.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Davis, Edgar E., Jr.	CPL	Army	Madison	Alabama
Davis, Madison L.	MSGT	Army	Pike	Alabama
Davis, Richard F.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Davison, Leslie E.	CPL	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Daw, Willie D.	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Dawson, Bobbie	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
De, France, Charles	PFC	Army	St. Clair	Alabama
Deason, Charles L.	PFC	Army	Perry	Alabama
Deason, George, Jr.	CPL	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Deland, Edward E., Jr.	SFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Denton, Robert	CPL	Army	Dale	Alabama
Dickinson, Percy E.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Divine, Winfield	PFC	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Dix, Marvin	PVT	Army	Pike	Alabama
Dixon, Melvin L.	SGT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Doby, Alfonso	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Donaldson, Tellis W.	MSGT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Donaldson, Weldon C.	PFC	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Dooley, Johnnie K.	PVT	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Doss, Theodore R.	PFC	Army	Marengo	Alabama
Dowling, Robert V.	MSGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Doyle, Thomas J.	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Dunn, Larry M.	PFC	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Dye, Robert L.	PVT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Echols, Tommie L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Ellis, Julius L.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Emmons, Clifford O.	CPL	Army	Choctaw	Alabama
Enfinger, Edgar	SGT	Army	Houston	Alabama
Evans, Corbit	PFC	Army	Marion	Alabama
Evans, Owens B.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Everett, William L.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Fancher, Maxie	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Farmer, Rudolph	SFC	Army	Covington	Alabama
Fincher, Roy L.	PFC	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Fleming, Robert P.	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Flowers, Horrie, Jr.	MSGT	Army	Pike	Alabama
Flowers, Odis B.	PFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
Floyd, Andrews J., Jr.	CPL	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Foster, James H.	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Foy, Sam	PFC	Army	Sumter	Alabama
Franklin, John, Jr.	PVT	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Frazier, Herbert W.	SGT	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Frazier, Vance	CPL	Marines	Easley	Alabama
Frazier, William H.	MAJ	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Freeman, John W.	CPL	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Fromhold, Joseph B.	PVT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Fulks, Daniel W.	SGT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Fuqua, Fred	SFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Gaines, Obie M.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Gamble, Gilbert	PVT	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Garner, James W.	PFC	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Garner, Max F.	PVT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Garrett, Herbert J.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Gates, Thomas V.	PVT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Gibby, Eddie	CPL	Army	Clarke	Alabama
Gigger, Quillie S.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Gill, Gerald S.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Gilland, J.W.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Gillespie, Champ G.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Gillespie, George D.	WO	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Glaze, Claude	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Glover, Joseph E., Jr.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED)¹—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County ²	State
Glover, Thomas, Jr.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Godwin, Robert E.	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Goode, John	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Goodson, Paul R.	SGT	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Gossett, John Louis	SSGT	Marines	Montgomery	Alabama
Graddy, William J.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Graham, Leonard F.	PFC	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Grant, Paul	PFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Grantham, Lawrence	PVT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Gray, Leo H.	PFC	Army	Limestone	Alabama
Gray, Merrett G.	CPL	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Grayson, Roy A.	2LT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Green, John L.	SFC	Army	Cherokee	Alabama
Greene, Claud, Jr.	PFC	Army	Morgan	Alabama
Greenhill, Bruce J.	2LT	Marines	Montgomery	Alabama
Gregory, Joe B., Jr.	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Griffis, Willie D.	PVT	Army	Limestone	Alabama
Grimes, Raymond	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Gross, Robert Franklin	MSGT	Air Force	Montgomery	Alabama
Gunter, William Howard	SSGT	Marines	Browns	Alabama
Guthrie, Robert H.	SFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Hagwood, Eddie, Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hall, Hedrey D.	PFC	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Hall, Howard W.	SFC	Army	Clarke	Alabama
Hallford, W.T.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Hallmark, Thomas J.	PFC	Marines	Bessemer	Alabama
Hambright, Garnett	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hammonds, Homer M.	PFC	Marines	Dawson	Alabama
Hampton, Leroy, Jr.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Hardeman, Julius F.	SGT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Hardin, George R.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Hardwick, Richard L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hardy, Isac	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hardy, James W.	PFC	Marines	Pell City	Alabama
Harless, Richard G.	SFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Harper, Rayford H.	SGT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Harris, James	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Harris, James A., Jr.	1LT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Harris, Lewis A.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Harris, Richmond Gilbert	PFC	Marines	Foster	Alabama
Harris, Roosevelt	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hart, Robert H.	PFC	Army	Conecok	Alabama
Hataway, Roy	PVT	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Hatley, William H.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hawkins, William M.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Haynes, James L.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Hays, Robert A.	PVT	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Hazwood, Clifford	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Heard, Booker T.	CPL	Army	Lee	Alabama
Heard, Delbert E.	SFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Hearn, Edwin F.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Helms, Henry L.	PFC	Army	De Kalb	Alabama
Hendrix, Charles R.	PVT	Army	Monroe	Alabama
Hendrix, Thomas Calvin	SGT	Marines	Hartselle	Alabama
Henry, Fred S.	CPL	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Henry, Kenneth, Jr.	PFC	Army	Lawrence	Alabama
Herring, Eugene	PFC	Army	Dale	Alabama
Herrington, Robert	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Hicks, Luther	CPL	Army	Greene	Alabama
Higgins, George Carlton	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Higgins, John S., Jr.	PFC	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Hill, Charles R., Jr.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Hill, John A.C.	PFC	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Hobbs, Elven J.	CPL	Army	Conecok	Alabama
Hoffman, Donald Edward	1LT	Air Force	Alexandria City	Alabama
Holder, Ray E.	SFC	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Holloway, Paul G.	PVT	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Holmes, Clyde Thadeus, Jr.	Capt	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Holt, Zane Moses	Maj	Air Force	Livingston	Alabama
Hopper, James H.	PFC	Marines	Altoona	Alabama
Horne, Russel T.	SGT	Army	Hale	Alabama
Horne, Waymond Leon	PFC	Marines	Lanett	Alabama
Horton, Charles Thomas	CSS	Navy	Columbiana	Alabama
Howard, Cordell	SGT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Howard, Frank R.	PVT	Army	Tallapoosa	Alabama
Howard, Oliver M.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Howze, Frank B.	Maj	Army	Perry	Alabama
Hoyt, Lester G.	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Hughes, Lucious W.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Hughes, Morris E.	PFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Hulett, Ervin	SGT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Hunter, Joseph Jr.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hunter, William Bryant	PFC	Marines	McDowell	Alabama
Hutchins, Johnnie R.	SGT	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Hyde, Daniel T.	SGT	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Ingle, Clarence B.	PFC	Army	De Kalb	Alabama
Jackson, Albert	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jackson, Arthur	1LT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Jackson, Comer, Jr.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Jackson, David Jr.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jackson, Irby L.	PVT	Army	De Kalb	Alabama
Jacobs, George L.	PVT	Army	Dallas	Alabama
James, Albert Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
January, James	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jarrell, Cleveland	PFC	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Jeter, James L.C.	PVT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Jeter, Robert M.	CPL	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Johnson, Fred S.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Johnson, Herbert D.	PFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Johnson, Leroy	SGT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Johnson, Wesley	PVT	Army	Chambers	Alabama
Johnston, Jimmie Curtis	PFC	Marines	Margaret	Alabama
Jones, Baskil	PVT	Army	Crenshaw	Alabama
Jones, Bobby J.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Jones, Charles W.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jones, Clarence G.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Jones, Joe D.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Jones, Joseph	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jones, Mack D.	SGT	Army	Winston	Alabama
Jones, Odis F.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED)¹—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County ²	State
Jones, Thomas C.	CPL	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Jones, William H.	PFC	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Jones, William T.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Jordan, Barney H.	SGT	Army	Bullock	Alabama
Journey, Richard M.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jumper, Joseph	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Justice, James W.	PFC	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Justice, Marion W.	PFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
Keith, John W., Jr.	COL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Kilby, Thomas E. III.	1LT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
King, Frank, Jr.	CPL	Army	Barbour	Alabama
King, Harvey	CPL	Army	Bullock	Alabama
King, Herbert	PFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
King, James Daniel	PFC	Marines	Ensley	Alabama
King, James Hubert	SN	Navy	Groushaw County	Alabama
King, William A.	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Kingsley, Willie L.	MSGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Kirby, Paul	PVT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Kirkland, Oland H.	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Kirkpatrick, Leslie	1LT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Klug, Kenneth W.	PFC	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Knudson, Jack L.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Kountz, Richard William	PVT	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Lacey, Robert L.	MSGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Ladner, Hobert P.	CPL	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Lane, Robert C.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Latham, Billy J.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Lathan, Climon N., Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Lawson, John E.	PFC	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Lee, Isaac, Jr.	PFC	Army	Monroe	Alabama
Lee, William T.	CPL	Army	Marion	Alabama
Lige, Amos	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Lilly, Edmund B.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Little, Robert H.	CPL	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Livingston, Odycce Watson	2LT	Marines	Montgomery	Alabama
Lloyd, Carl Hubert	PFC	Marines	Monroeville	Alabama
Locklar, Vernon H.	SFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
Logan, William F.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Loggins, Floyd B.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Long, John B.	2LT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Lott, George W.	1LT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Love, William Murdock	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Mack, Paul, Jr.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Madison, Garland E.	CAPT	Air Force	Gadsden	Alabama
Magouirk, Lawrence	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Maltbie, Rubin R.	PVT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Manley, William J.	SGT	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Marcus, O.C., Jr.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Marold, William E.	PFC	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Martin, Joel R.	CPL	Army	Conecuh	Alabama
Martin, William B.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Mason, Jim H.	CPL	Army	Walker	Alabama
Matson, Arthur A., Jr.	SGT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Matthews, Glenn	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Mauldin, Sydney R.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
May, Levert	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Mayo, Joseph Haynes	CPL	Marines	York	Alabama
Mayo, Marvin	CPL	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Mays, John, Jr.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
McAlphine, Johnny L.	PFC	Army	Blount	Alabama
McCall, Terry S.	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
McCarty, Frank W.	CPL	Army	Pike	Alabama
McClure, John S.	SGT	Army	Colbert	Alabama
McCullers, Charles	PFC	Army	Elmore	Alabama
McCullough, James	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
McDaniel, Howard H.	PFC	Army	Pickens	Alabama
McGee, Dave	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
McGee, William R.	PFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
McGhee, Richard D.	CPL	Army	Morgan	Alabama
McIntyre, Clifton	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
McLeod, William	PFC	Army	Dale	Alabama
McMillan Reveren	PVT	Army	Dallas	Alabama
McGarnie, Kenneth Eugene	PFC	Marines	Huntsville	Alabama
Meadows, Vernon	PVT	Army	Coosa	Alabama
Mefford, Jake, Jr.	SPC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Melcher, Huey P.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Meyer, Harry, Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Miles, Claud	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Miller, Augustus	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Miller, Cecil	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Miller, Frank Edward, Jr.	CAPT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Miller, Grady H.	CPL	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Miller, Joe R.	CPL	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Miller, Vernon Eugene	PFC	Marines	Horton	Alabama
Mills, Eugene O.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Mills, Hilery W.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Mitchell, Archie F.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Mitchell, Bobby A.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Mitchell, Grady Purden, Jr.	1LT	Marines	Selma	Alabama
Mitchell, William L.	PVT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Mixon, Herman L.	SGT	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Moore, David L.	PFC	Army	Washington	Alabama
Morphew, James E.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Morris, Harry R.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Morris, Max A.	MAJ	Army	Blount	Alabama
Morris, Milton, Jr.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Morrow, Billy J.	PFC	Marines	Goodwater	Alabama
Morton, Ralph Franklin	FA	Navy	Alabama City	Alabama
Moseley, Samuel L.	SFC	Army	Cherokee	Alabama
Moss, Alonza	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Murphree, Calvin	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Nabors, Dixon H.	2LT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Nelson, James H.	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Nelson, Jerome S.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Nelson, Paul R.	PFC	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Nelson, Richard P.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Nevins, Guy Holder, III	1LT	Air Force	Montgomery	Alabama
Newell, Jersome E.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Newton, Forster E., Jr.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Odom, Newman R.	SFC	Army	Walker	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED)¹—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County ²	State
O'Hara, Cordell	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Olive, James G.	CPL	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Oliver, Jesse Harold	SGT	Army	Birmingham	Alabama
Oliver, Kenneth E.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Ousley, James A.	CPL	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Overstreet, James Douglas	SN	Navy	Montgomery	Alabama
Overton, Robert E.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pace, Charlie J.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Parker, Alfred P.	PFC	Army	Coosa	Alabama
Parker, Dixie S.	1LT	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Parker, F.D.	PVT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Parker, Olen	SSGT	Marines	Hartselle	Alabama
Parker, Oscar B.	PFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Parmer, William E.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Parrish, Willie P.	PVT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Partridge, Walter R.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pate, Billy C.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Patrick, Willie	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Patterson, Clarence	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Peak, Willie L.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pearce, Thomas P. Jr.	2LT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pearsall, Gilbert B.	1LT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Pendergrass, Leon B.	MSGT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Penland, Raymond D.	SFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Perkins, Frank	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Peterman, Paul	PVT	Army	Houston	Alabama
Pettit, Raymond C.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Phelps, Woodrow W.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Phillips, Billy M.	PFC	Army	Limestone	Alabama
Phillips, Hugh B.	PVT	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Phillips, Richard L.	PVT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Pickens, Freddie F.	SFC	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Pickett, James L.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pickett, Robert Edward	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Piper, Ranson D. Jr.	CPL	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Pitts, Clyde T.	SGT	Marines	Gadsden	Alabama
Pitts, John W.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Pogue, James F.	PFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Polarie, Howard L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Poole, Lovell	SGT	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Poore, Elvis J.	PFC	Army	Winston	Alabama
Porter, Alec W.	PFC	Army	Clay	Alabama
Posey, Noland D.	CPL	Army	Madison	Alabama
Potter, Morris L.	MAJ	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Pounds, Lester M. Jr.	PVT	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Powell, Buford B.	CPL	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Powell, James R.	PVT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Prentice, Robert H.	PVT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Prestwood, Virgil W.	PFC	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Pritchett, Dixie C.	PVT	Army	Clarke	Alabama
Pugh, William A.	1LT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Raber, Rudolph	PFC	Army	Balwin	Alabama
Raines, Alford B.	SGT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Randall, Elgin V.	CPL	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Ratliff, Jerry	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Rawls, Charles W.	PVT	Army	Hale	Alabama
Ray, Alton G.	PFC	Marines	Courtland	Alabama
Raye, Leroy J.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Reaves, James W.	CAPT	Army	Lee	Alabama
Reed, Cecil	PFC	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Reese, Leon	SGT	Marines	Huntsville	Alabama
Reese, Willie	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Reid, Elbert Josephus Jr.	SSGT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Richard, Ralph Leslie	CPL	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Richard, N.L.	SGT	Army	Monroe	Alabama
Riddle, James R.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Rigdon, Edward W.	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Riner, Claude L. Jr.	PFC	Army	Colbert	Alabama
Rivers, Norman O.	SGT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Rives, Joel Orlander	1LT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Roberson, Edward L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Roberts, Jeff, Jr.	PVT	Army	Houston	Alabama
Robinson, James	SFC	Army	Hale	Alabama
Robinson, Wilda E.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Rogato, Costanzo	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Rogers, Harvey W.	2LT	Army	St Clair	Alabama
Rogers, Willie L.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Root, Voorhees S. Jr.	SSGT	Air Force	Huntsville	Alabama
Roper, Hillard Marshall	MAJ	Air Force	Auburn	Alabama
Ross, James	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Ruddell, Adler Earl	AD3	Navy	Batesville	Alabama
Rushing, Harry Eugene	2LT	Air Force	Montgomery	Alabama
Rushing, Larry W.	PFC	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Salze, Floyd Wheeler	CAPT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Sanders, Wade C.	PVT	Army	Sumter	Alabama
Sanford, Bernie L.	MSGT	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Sanford, Isadore	PVT	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Sasser, Ralph	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Saunders, Harry J.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Sawyer, Doll B.	PVT	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Schauffer, William	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Shackelford, Allen	PFC	Army	Sumter	Alabama
Shauf, William Jerome	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Shea, Andrew B.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Shelton, Leslie Taylor, Jr.	1LT	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Shy, Henry H.	PFC	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Silver, Clarence P.	PFC	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Simmons, Glen D.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Simmons, Johnnie L.	PFC	Army	Bullock	Alabama
Simmons, Willie H.	PFC	Army	St Clair	Alabama
Skelton, John C.	CPL	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Slaten, Waymon	PFC	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Slatton, Hayden W.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Sloan, Carl T.	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Smalley, Alfred August	SGT	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Smith, Billy E.	PVT	Army	Chambers	Alabama
Smith, Charles	1LT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Smith, Grover C.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Smith, Harold L.	2LT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Smith, James H.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED)¹—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County ²	State
Smith, Moses	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Smith, Rufus A.	PFC	Army	Blount	Alabama
Smith, Travis	SFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Smith, Walter M.	PVT	Army	Tallapoosa	Alabama
Smith, William L.	SFC	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Sommude, Louis M.	1LT	Army	Geneva	Alabama
South, Ernest C.	PFC	Army	Covington	Alabama
Spain, Robert L.	PFC	Army	Pickens	Alabama
Speegle, Kelton	MSGT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Spence, Grover C. Jr.	PFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Spivey, Bobby E.	CPL	Army	Madison	Alabama
Spragins, Robert E.	CAPT	Air Force	Huntsville	Alabama
Springer, Marvin R.	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Stagg, Thomas C.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Staggs, William C.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Stanford, James C.	PFC	Army	Wilcox	Alabama
Stanphill, Dock L.	PFC	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Steele, Auther R.	PVT	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Steele, Harold M.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Steele, John W.	SFC	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Steen, Gerald D.	CPL	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Stewart, David L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Stewart, Edward F.	CPL	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Stewart, Gerald W.	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Stewart, Huell J. Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Stiefel, Ernest J.	PVT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Stokes, John M.	2LT	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Story, Martin L.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Strickland, Marvin	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Strickland, Pete	PFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Stickland, Terrell	PFC	Army	Dale	Alabama
Stubblefield, Billy	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Sulser, James E.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Summers, James E.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Sutton, Andrew M.	CPL	Army	Pickens	Alabama
Sweatt, Walter M.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Tennille, James E.	PVT	Army	Barbour	Alabama
Terrell, William	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Tew, Bernard	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Third, Jack H.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Thomas, Fred	PFC	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Thomas, James, Jr.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Thomas, Johnny W.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Thomas, Joseph, Jr.	SGT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Thomas, Mitchell C.	2LT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Thomas, Roy L.	CPL	Army	Blount	Alabama
Thompson, James L.	2LT	Army	Cleburne	Alabama
Thornton, William B.	SGT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Thrasher, Billy L.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Threat, Woodie B.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Thurman, Ruben, Jr.	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Tilley, Herbert L.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Tindell, James, Jr.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Tolbert, Barney A.	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Trent, James O.	SFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Trimm, John Edward	HM3	Army	Birmingham	Alabama
Trione, James J.	PFC	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Turner, Robert G.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Turner, Thomas J.	PVT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Tyner, John T.	PFC	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Vails, Maxwell W.	MAJ	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Van Horn, Irving	SGT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Varner, Alvin L.	CPL	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Varner, Gene C.	PVT	Army	Coosa	Alabama
Vaughn, Jack Dennis	PFC	Marines	Wilmer	Alabama
Vickers, Ivey E.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Vickery, Charles J.	PVT	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Wadsworth, William	2LT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Waid, Homer L.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Walker, Walter L.	PVT	Army	Blount	Alabama
Wallace, Floyd	PVT	Army	Choctaw	Alabama
Wallace, Howard E.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Wallace, John W.	PVT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Walther, Charles P.	2LT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Walton, Bobby B.	PFC	Army	Clay	Alabama
Wance, Ralph R.	CAPT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Washington, Joseph	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Washington, Preston	SGT	Marines	Warrior	Alabama
Watford, Billy S.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Watson, John W.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Watson, Leonard	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Watson, William E.	PVT	Army	Wilcox	Alabama
Watts, Eddie	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Weaver, Carlos D.	PVT	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Webb, Jerald C.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Weeks, Grady M.	SSGT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Weldon, Elbert	PFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Weldon, Olebia B.	SFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Wendling, George Vincent	MAJ	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Wesson, Lee C.	CPL	Army	Walker	Alabama
Wester, Robert	CPL	Army	Cherokee	Alabama
Westry, James P.	PFC	Army	Wilcox	Alabama
Wheeler, John H.	PFC	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Whisenant, Nols L.	CPL	Army	Marshall	Alabama
White, James, S.	PFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
White, John H.	CPL	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Whitehead, Lee Jr.	CPL	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Wilbourn, Julian D.	PVT	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Wilks, Van L.	PVT	Army	DeKalb	Alabama
Williams, Basil A.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Williams, Buck	CPL	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Williams, Herman	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Williams, James M.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Williams, Jasper D.	PVT	Army	Washington	Alabama
Williams, John J.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Williams, John Jr.	PVT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Williams, Olen B.	MSGT	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Williams, Paul R.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Williams, Roosevelt	PVT	Army	Lee	Alabama
Williams, Roosevelt	CPL	Army	Russell	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED)¹—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County ²	State
Willis, Charles A.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Willis, Elbert F.	CPL	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Wilson, Clarence O.	CPL	Army	Walker	Alabama
Wilson, Garvin	SGT	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Wilson, James E.	SFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Wilson, Juan B.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Wilson, Robert D.	PVT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Winchester, William	PVT	Army	Lawrence	Alabama
Womack, Robert W.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Wood, Bobby J.	CPL	Army	Blount	Alabama
Wood, Wallace Norman	Capt	Marines	Greenville	Alabama
Woods, Thomas B. Jr.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Woodson, Lewis B.	PFC	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Worrell, Leonard E.	PFC	Army	Conecuh	Alabama
Worth, Jack	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Wright, Preston A.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Wyatt, Wilmer T.	SGT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Yancy, Robert G.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Yaw, Billy G.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Yelverton, V.S.	PVT	Army	Perry	Alabama
Young, David R.	PFC	Army	Cullman	Alabama
TOTAL—672				

¹ For persons who died while missing or captured, the date of casualty is the date died not the date declared missing or captured.² Army lists county: Air Force, Navy and Marines list city or town or place.

Source: Korean conflict casualty file, 1950–1957 (machine-readable record), Record Secretary of Defense, record group 330.

For further information, please contact the Center's Reference Staff.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the text of my speech.

KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL SPEECH—
FULTONDALE, ALABAMA, SUNDAY, JULY 25, 1999

Throughout the Bible, God calls on his Children to remember. To remember the wonderful works He has done, His miracles and the judgment He uttered (Psalms 105:5). We are told not only to remember the good days, but the difficult as well. "Remember that you were a slave in Egypt," he reminded the children of Israel. Remember the days of old, and consider. Recall what the Lord your God did.

And when they forget to remember the hard lessons or the sweet blessings of the past, failure was not far away. When we read the Bible, we are sometimes frustrated seeing God's children repeating their mistakes time and time again. Being so unappreciative. Why did they forget? Why didn't they remember?

But are we so different? We forget a whole war and the sacrifices made. Is not America's treatment of the Korean War not parallel? Why did we forget? Why were we so unappreciative?

The Korean War concluded not with the enemy's surrender, but with the negotiated armistice that re-established the earlier boundary between North and South, leaving an uneasy peace that lingers today. With tens of thousands of young Americans brutally killed and in such a remote and inhospitable land so far away and with no victory to celebrate, the Korean War gave most Americans of that time little to remember and much to forget. That is why the Korean War is often spoken of as the forgotten war.

However, there is much to remember about this war and about those who left farms and factories, high school classrooms and college campuses to serve their country.

Today, we assemble together to remember. To recall and consider. We are not here to cheer or to celebrate but to reflect on the sacrifices of so many made so long ago. To remember the living, those who survived and are here today. Those who died and lie buried about us, and those whose bodies were never recovered to lie beneath the green, green grass of home.

World War II had followed World War I, the war to end all wars. The long struggle against Nazism and imperialism was over and America, although victorious, was so weary of war. America and her people knew well the cost, the horror and the sacrifice of war.

But in June 1950, one and a half million of America's finest patriots left their families,

friends and homes to help defend freedom. Halfway around the world they went, or as so aptly inscribed on the Korean War Memorial, to "a place they had never been and a people they had never met." These were citizen soldiers. For the most part not skilled in the art of war, but ordinary young men and women like our sons and daughters, who, when the time came, showed extraordinary courage.

We should remember, too, the terrible hardships our Korean War veterans endured. The deadly cold, the weeks and months spent crammed in foxholes and bunkers dug into an unbelievably rugged and harsh terrain. They faced an enemy of overwhelming numbers ready to torture and brutalize. They were locked in hand-to-hand combat on "Heartbreak Ridge" and "Porkchop Hill" and confronted the world's fastest fighter jets in "Mig Alley." Today's military history records that our Korean veterans set a standard of courage that may be matched, but which will never be surpassed. Ordinary men and women who showed extraordinary courage.

Chiseled in silver on the Korean War memorial are the words "Freedom is not free." The men and women who served in Korea and the family and friends of those 36,914 who never returned and those thousands of Americans who were lost in Korea and whose bodies to this day have never been found demonstrate the high and precious cost of freedom. We should never forget that these patriots paid the price one at a time when they were swept away in the treacherous tides of Inchon or died defending the perimeter of Pusan, or froze to death by the hundreds at Chosan reservoir or in the long march out. Their families will never forget their sacrifice and neither will we.

Now on this hot, sunny summer day 46 years after the July armistice, we have a new reason to remember those who left home and struggled to stop the spread of aggression, for we now know that it was these veterans who took the first resolute action to stem the expansion of communism, and in doing so helped change the course of history. Now we know it took four more decades to win the battle against communism, but having witnessed the collapse of the Berlin Wall and its aftermath we know that those who served in Korea laid the foundations for one of the greatest victories in the history of mankind: the free world triumph over communism.

As we leave this memorial, this observance, let us be reminded the Korean War is not a forgotten war. It is a war most worthy of remembrance. Let us, on behalf of all the free people of the world, remember the men

and women who died not only in the Korean War, but in all our wars. Finally, let us give thanks to those men and women who have given their lives for our freedom, and give thanks to God for them and for those who stand guard over America today, defending and preserving our freedom.

PUTTING CHILDREN FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this body to stop over-spending on defense and start spending on the needs of our children. We need to put children first.

Our military spending is still at Cold War levels. Each year, we allocate more than half of federal discretionary spending to military efforts. In contrast, for education, that figure is less than 9 percent. As a nation, we rank 1st in military spending but only 10th globally in spending for education. It should then come as no surprise, that in a recent international study of 21 industrialized nations the students of the United States ranked 19th in math and science performance.

This Congress voted to increase the Pentagon's budget by 112 billion dollars over the next six years. Incredibly, that is nearly the same amount of money needed to repair the nation's schools according to a report by the General Accounting Office.

Our schools are in dire need of assistance. many are crumbling, cracking, and splitting at the seams. That same GAO report informed us that 14 million pupils nationwide are being educated in unsatisfactory environments. These children are attending school in facilities that either need extensive structural repair or the replacement of one or more buildings. In my home state of Michigan, for example, more than 1 in 5 schools have at least one building in need of serious repair, and more than half of Michigan's schools have at least one serious environmental health problem.

We all accept the fact that learning environment affects the quality of the education our children receive. I ask you: "How do we expect our children to learn, when we do not

give them the clean and safe places to do so?" We need to get the asbestos out of the classrooms. We need to get children out of trailers and portable classrooms. We need to fix leaking roofs, repair plumbing facilities and ensure each student is studying under adequate light.

Ms. Lenora Starks, a constituent of mine, recently wrote to me. She was concerned that we weren't doing enough to help our public schools. "We must ensure," she wrote, "that our students have a proper learning environment. In too many schools, efforts to improve student achievement are hampered by inadequate and deteriorating facilities."

Ms. Starks can see our priorities. She sees that this Congress has not been putting children first and is worried about what that means for our nation's future.

We need to put children first by increasing spending on Head Start. Rather than giving an excess of 17 billion unrequested dollars to the bloated Pentagon budget, we could fully fund Head Start for the next five years. And this funding is critical. Because of inadequate federal funding, Head Start is only able to serve 30 percent of eligible children. Lack of federal fund also causes most children to wait until the age of four to enter the program, when evidence supports earlier intervention is more effective.

Children are also adversely affected by a lack of financial commitment to low-income families and to impoverished neighborhoods. One example is the malignant neglect of the childcare crisis in this country. The 105th Congress only provided 182 million dollars this year to improve the quality of children care in this country. This fell far short of the estimated 7.5 billion dollars needed to provide safe and affordable child care for working families. Full-day child care costs up to 10,000 per year, yet half of America's families with young children earn less than 35,000 per year. Child care in low-income communities must be a priority if parents are going to be able to seize opportunities to provide for their children.

Regarding neighborhoods, support for Community Development Block Grants, which have a long history of providing economic aid to underserved areas, is declining. In the city of Detroit, CDBG funding has declined from 130.1 million to 51.3 million over the past 19 years. For fiscal year 2000, current proposals by this Congress would continue the downward trend. With one in five American children living in poverty, cuts to CDBGs undoubtedly affect their futures. Studies show that poor children are less likely to finish school, are at heightened risk of stunted growth and other health problems and contribute less to our economy as adults. We must restore the CDBGs to their original vitality and reverse the years of cutbacks if we really want to help the youngest victims of poverty.

Congress also misdirects spending by failing to support youth employment initiatives. While increasing the Pentagon's budget over the past two years, Congress has concurrently cut youth job training by 80 percent and federal support for summer jobs for young people. Young people must have avenues to pursue their dreams.

We need to reprioritize our allocation of funds in this nation. We need to put children first. This is not a choice, this is a must.

TITLE IX AND ROLE OF U.S. WOMEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I raise my voice in praise of title IX and the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team.

There is no doubt in my mind that title IX has been successful in expanding opportunities for women in athletics. Before title IX, women represented only 1 percent of college athletes, and virtually no athletic scholarships went to women. Because of title IX, more than 100,000 women now participate in intercollegiate college sports.

The purpose of title IX is to provide the same opportunities for women in education as men. While we celebrate the great strides that women have made in competitive athletics, we should also recognize that title IX has made an impact and opened doors in other areas of education.

The U.S. Women's National Soccer Team, our 1999 Women's World Cup champions, they certainly made it clear that women can make a tremendous contribution to sports. These dedicated, determined, and accomplished young women make me proud to be associated with the cause of getting more girls and women involved with sports and fitness.

Title IX and the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team have changed the playing field for girls and women in athletics. But since title IX was passed in 1972, there has been a world of change in our expectations of what women can achieve.

Women like Mia Hamm and Michelle Akers on the soccer field, and Colonel Eileen Collins, who is commander of the shuttle flight Columbia, they have shown the skeptics that women can successfully participate in every walk of American life. They are all long-distance runners in the challenge and the struggle to raise the status of women in our society.

When I was growing up, most people thought that girls were not as interested in sports as boys. Consequently, girls were discouraged from participating in sports activities. Now research by the Women's Sports Foundation shows that, on the contrary, boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 9 are equally interested in sports participation. By the age of 14, however, girls drop out of sports participation at a rate six times greater than boys. Something must have happened.

Now, after the U.S. Women's Soccer Team has won the 1999 Women's World Cup, young girls have aspirational and inspiration role models that will no doubt increase their participation in sports. They are growing up and appreciating the sports skills of women, and they see images of themselves excelling in sports.

Young women who participate in sports are more likely to finish school,

less likely to have an unwanted pregnancy. The availability of athletic scholarships has enabled more women to pursue a college education and has opened opportunities for women at dozens of colleges.

Let me just point out the health benefits of regular and rigorous physical exercise are extensive. Studies show that women who participate in sports actually lower their risk of breast cancer and are 92 percent less likely to be involved with drugs. There are also psychological benefits. Young women who play sports have a higher level of self-esteem, a lower incidence of depression, and a more positive body image.

I am sure that, all over America, young girls are achieving success on the athletic field and thinking about growing up to be soccer or basketball stars. Others are applying themselves to their studies, and they are dreaming about becoming scientists or engineers or even Members of Congress.

These young women can feel safe and secure in their dreams because title IX will be there to protect them from the barriers of discrimination.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the fiscal year 2000 budget. Adoption of the budget is the most important job that Congress performs. Like a sound business or well-run household, our budget establishes our priorities for the next year.

The news of our income for the next year looks amazingly good. The President's Office of Management and Budget is estimating a \$99 billion surplus, including Social Security monies. However, without Social Security, we have a deficit. If we protect Social Security incomes, the surplus drops to \$5 billion.

OMB's 10-year projection of \$1 trillion surplus may be a dangerous phantom. There is a surplus only if we include Social Security funds. Without Social Security funds, we will have a deficit.

The available surplus is much smaller than what we think. When all of the figures are calculated in a responsible manner, our surplus is more like \$112 billion, hardly enough to afford the almost \$800 billion 10-year tax cut package that the Republicans are considering.

Two of this administration's enormous accomplishments are the substantial reduction of a deficit and a buoyant economy. In good economic times, a wise family makes certain that the essentials for a decent household is that the soundness of the physical foundations are in tact, a good roof, a good basement, sound plumbing and wiring, adequate nutrition, basic health care, excellent schools, a

healthy neighborhood, adequate infrastructure, transportation, clean air and clean water.

□ 1945

This is what we all want for our families. What a business aspires to have is a sound basis of operation, and that is what we want for our Nation.

Congress' work is to look at our income of hard-earned tax money and use this money to provide a decent and functioning Nation; a Nation which we all can be proud of, a Nation of well-educated people, well housed, well fed, healthy, with a decent regard for themselves and for each other and the common good. We must have serious priorities for the serious business of being a sound Nation.

Now, the majority cuts taxes for the rich and ignores problems that are screaming for attention. We must pay down our debts to lower our interest rates, but we must also respond to our housing problems. We have over 5.5 million households that are in substandard housing. In my district alone, the waiting list for housing assistance opened for 1 day in May of 1997, and 15,000 applicants stood in line for a waiting list running up to 5 years. In my county of Alameda, the wait list has been closed since 1991. Taking care of our housing stock should be one of our national priorities.

Over 43 million do not have health coverage. In California, among working families of employed single adults with children, 55 percent have no insurance. The number of uninsured children has increased by 25 percent during these amazing economic times. About 8 million Californians are not covered at all. Prescription drugs are being priced out of the reach of seniors, and I fully support the President's plan to address this need. Provision of essential prescriptions should be one of our national priorities.

There will be more students. Our classrooms are crowded. A record 52.7 million children are enrolled in elementary and secondary schools, and this number will climb to 54.3 million by 2008. We do not train our teachers sufficiently, and we do not pay our teachers sufficiently. We do not have enough teachers. We do not have enough counselors. We do not have enough school buildings, and much of what we have is aging and must be rehabilitated. Most of our schools are not connected to the Internet. The Republican tax bill is silent on these issues and all of these needs. These educational needs must be one of our national priorities for attention.

Almost 70 percent of this tax freedom bill, as it is called, goes to reduce taxes of the wealthiest 10 percent of the people, with incomes over \$204,000 a year. Only 9 percent of this bill goes toward reducing the taxes of about 70 percent of our people.

There is hunger in our cities and there is hunger in many of our rural areas. The Washington Post reported

that our military personnel and their families depend upon second and third jobs, food stamps, and cast-away furniture in order to feed and house their families. Eliminating hunger should be a national priority. Providing adequate wages for working people should be a national priority.

This is our chance to do what is right. This is our chance. Our rivers can be cleaned, our air can be improved. This is our chance to take care of the physical conditions of our environs; a program to continue our Superfund and brown fields cleanup, reforestation, and preservation of endangered species.

We have important and essential work to do together to recognize that the priorities of our country should be putting people first. It should ensure that we make our country strong, physically, socially and economically.

ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to also talk about where we go on the budget and also where we have been on this budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans were elected as a majority back in 1995. For almost every year before that, for the previous 40 years, the Democrat majority in this House used every cent of the Social Security surplus and spent it on other government programs. When Republicans came in, in 1995, we came in with the enthusiasm to try to make government more efficient. We said, look, there has to be a balanced budget, and so we started cutting back on spending.

We actually had a rescission bill. We started our session in January of 1995; but already, because we operate on a fiscal year, we had gone through the first one quarter of the budget year. But, still, with three-quarters left, we decided to cut down on the spending authorized for the rest of that year. We were successful, and we held the line on increased spending.

The following year, with a great deal of effort and dedication, but also controversy, we did the same thing, because we were dedicated to the proposition that we should have a balanced budget and that Congress should live under the same logical, practical rules that every family has to live under, and that is that we had to try to pay down our debt and try to live within our means.

We took a great deal of criticism that year and through the next election and were charged with accusations such as "Republicans are taking food out of the mouths of children," and "they are radical," and "they are taking the security out of Social Security," and "they are reducing spending at the sacrifice of America and the sacrifice of our economy." Of course, that

did not happen, and we were successful in reaching a balanced budget.

Now, I think everybody agrees, the President included, that a balanced budget is reasonable. The question and the challenge is do we continue down the road we have had for so many years, the last 45 years, of moving for a bigger, more expensive, more intrusive Federal Government, really on the road to socialism; or do we set some priorities and do we say what is reasonable for taxpayers to pay in terms of the money they earn?

Right now the average taxpayer in the United States pays about 40 cents out of every dollar they earn in taxes to local, State and Federal Government. If we include the regulations that we impose on business, then it gets up to about 50 cents. So the first question is, how big should government be in terms of what earnings and income is? I say it is at its largest. Our taxes today are larger than they have ever been in the history of this country except for World War II.

Now, should we pay down the debt or reduce taxes with some of the surpluses that are projected? In the budget we passed this year, we took what many of us have been preaching for the last several years, and that is to say that we were not going to use any of the Social Security surplus for any other government spending, and we came up with this idea of a lockbox.

The lockbox is simply using every penny of the surplus coming into Social Security and using that money to pay down the debt held by the public. So it does not solve the Social Security problem, but at least it does not spend it for other government programs.

Now, the challenge is, as we look at approximately a trillion dollars coming in over the next 10 years in income taxes, and another definition for surpluses in income taxes is somebody that is being overtaxed, how much of that money should go towards paying down the debt; how much of that money should be used for expanded government spending; and how much of that money should go into tax relief, or giving back to the American people? Or a better way to say that is let the American people keep a few more dollars of what they have earned.

This tax reduction bill we passed the other day does both; it is a demand on paying down the debt as well as a tax cut for every American.

We have defined our goal of reducing the debt in terms of how much the debt service costs in this country. Alan Greenspan told our Committee on the Budget that a good way to measure the imposition of how big the debt is in this country is to measure the debt service cost. That is how much interest we pay out. That is \$360 billion a year. We need to bring that down. That interest rate is now tied to whether or not we have across-the-board tax reductions. So we set back the across-the-board tax reduction for any year that we do not reduce the interest cost.

So I think it is correct, and I hope most of us agree, that we save Social Security and Medicare, but we also work at paying down the debt and we let the American people keep a few more dollars of what they have earned. They already work 4 months and 11 days during the year for taxes. That is enough.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2398

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 2398, a bill that would have disastrous consequences for the economy of my district, Las Vegas, Nevada.

H.R. 2398, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, is an example of the worst type of Federal Government meddling in local matters and senseless overregulation. I believe this is an issue of importance to Members of Congress and local governments across the country.

Here is the situation in a nutshell: the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors' Authority needs to expand its convention center to accommodate the growing needs of major trade shows and conventions. This type of business is the lifeblood of the economy of my district, and hundreds of thousands of jobs depend on it. I know, because I worked in the tourism business for many, many years before coming here, and I served as a business consultant trying to meet the needs of the convention industry in my hometown. I know firsthand how critically important it is for Las Vegas to expand its convention center, and I know how important these facilities are to dozens of other communities around the Nation.

Just 3 weeks ago, the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors' Authority was ready to issue revenue bonds exempt from Federal taxes. As my colleagues know, local government entities routinely issue tax exempt bonds to meet their building needs. The bond measure would allow my hometown convention center to add enough floor space to meet the needs of the convention business and maintain our reputation as one of the finest convention venues in the world into the 21st century.

The bond measure was the result of responsible local government planning for the future, to maintain a strong economy for the benefit of the 1.3 million residents of southern Nevada.

Then something shocking and outrageous happened, and it happened right here in this House. From 2,500 miles away, one of my district's most important economic development projects was torpedoed, but only temporarily, I hope. At the last minute the convention authority was forced to postpone its sale of bonds after H.R. 2398 was introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) on June 30.

The remarks of the gentleman from Texas in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

indicate Houston, his hometown, cannot compete with Las Vegas as a convention destination. He targeted Las Vegas with legislation designed to stop the expansion of the new convention center.

H.R. 2398 bears the obscure and seemingly harmless title of The Private Activity Bond Clarification Act of 1999. In reality, this measure would drop a bomb on the proposed Las Vegas convention center expansion and on every other public building project in the United States that uses similar tax exempt financing.

The Las Vegas convention center expansion project is a model of prudent use of public monies and sound planning. The bonds were to be repaid through hotel room tax revenues, exactly the revenues that would grow because there would be more convention space, attracting more visitors to southern Nevada.

With a Federal tax exemption, the cost of the convention center bonds would be low and the convention center will be able to accommodate conventions that otherwise would be turned away. The financing through tax exempt bonds meets every State and Federal rule and regulation.

But now, out of the blue, comes H.R. 2398. This bill seeks to kill the Federal tax exemption by changing the IRS codes, even though the current IRS codes set clear qualifications for projects in order to be tax exempt. And I might add that this project in Las Vegas meets all of these current qualifications.

H.R. 2398 is simply a solution in search of a problem. It sets out to fix something that ain't broke, and in the process H.R. 2398 could do a whole lot of damage throughout the United States. H.R. 2398 could drive up the costs of convention centers and arenas around the country by banning tax exempt bonds for those projects. It promotes the absurd concept that the Federal Government should tax local governments.

□ 2000

For no good reason, H.R. 2398 gobbles up local dollars by forcing local entities such as the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority to borrow money at higher interest rates because they would no longer qualify for Federal tax-exempt status. This amounts to an unfunded mandate and an onerous burden on our cities and our towns. I say we should be encouraging the economic boost that convention centers bring to a community, not discouraging them.

H.R. 2398 is totally out of step with the times. I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) must be aware that we are in an era of streamlining the IRS, not expanding it. We are in an era of reducing government intrusion on State and local matters, not meddling in them. We are in an era that recognizes the value of public-private partnerships to stimulate economic

growth. And we are certainly in an era when we are all trying to lower the tax burdens, not raise them. H.R. 2398 is on the wrong side of all of these issues and we must reject it for the economic health of our local communities. The defeat of H.R. 2398 will also defeat Federal Government meddling in local affairs and defeat overregulation and it will be a victory for common sense.

WHITHER THE SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have a surplus now. It is the first time since 1969 that we have had a surplus. We have this for two reasons: Number one, Congress has finally slowed down the rate of growth in government. Very important concept. We are questioning bureaucrats on how they spend our money. But, number two, and most importantly, we have a surplus because the American people have worked their tails off in the last several years and they have put in 50 and 60 hours a week and the revenues to our coffers have increased tremendously.

So now we have a big debate, a good debate going on, what to do with this surplus. I believe that there are three essential things that we should do, and that was what the debate last week was, on tax reduction.

Number one, what we should do with this surplus is pay our Social Security debts. Protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare. The President of the United States in January stood right where you are, Mr. Speaker, and said, "Let's protect 62 percent of the Social Security surplus." But the Republican Party said, "No, Mr. President, we want to protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and not just protect it on paper but put it in a lockbox so that it cannot be used for roads and bridges and pay raises and new entitlement programs but that money will be there for your mom and your dad's retirement."

And so, Mr. Speaker, this bill puts aside 100 percent of the Social Security surplus to the tune of \$1.9 trillion, protecting and preserving Social Security and Medicare.

Number two, this bill pays down the debt. For 40 years, because of irresponsible congressional spending, we have accumulated a \$5.4 trillion debt. This bill takes the first serious step of paying down approximately \$2 trillion of that debt by having a trigger device. The trigger device says that if you want to get a tax reduction, you have to pay down the debt. And unless the debt is paid down, then the tax reduction portion is not triggered. It is the first time that has ever been done by the House.

The third thing, of course, that the bill does is it provides the American people with \$792 billion of their money

back for their overpayment in government. I am so sick and tired of people in Washington talking about how much the tax reduction is going to cost us. Guess what? It does not cost us anything because it is not our money, Mr. Speaker. It belongs to the American people.

If you go in Wal-Mart and you buy a pair of flip-flops for \$2.50 and you give the cashier \$5, they do not keep your money. It is your money. But if you have a Washington bureaucrat cashier, you will never see your change. They will give you more shoes, more flip-flops, they will even charge you. Before you know it the \$2.50 purchase becomes a \$6 and \$7 purchase. That is how ridiculous things are in this town, Mr. Speaker. It is the American people's money and we need to give it back to them.

This comes in the form of a 10 percent tax reduction across the board, capital gains tax reduction, estate tax relief, relief for small businesses and farmers. The President of the United States, stickler for truth as he always has been, will come in and say, "Oh, you're taking money away from seniors, from children, from the environment, from education." Well, if you are a Republican and you cross the street, the American President right now is going to accuse you of hurting seniors and children and the environment and education. It does not matter. He is a broken record. It is a formula that works for him, class warfare and scare-mongering. But we are sick and tired of it.

It is interesting that liberal Senator BOB KERREY said that when you are talking about a \$3 trillion surplus, an \$800 billion tax reduction program is not reckless or irresponsible. That is from a well thought of, but liberal, Democratic Senator. He is saying, "What's the big deal?"

What is the big deal, Mr. Speaker? We are talking about the size of a tax cut. We are not talking about whether to have one or not. The President has already agreed to one. Most of the liberals in Congress have agreed to one. We are only talking about the size of it.

Mr. Speaker, this tax package that was voted on the other day, again three-pronged, protects and preserves Social Security to the tune of \$1.9 trillion through a lockbox, and protects 100 percent of it; number two, pays down the debt \$2 trillion; and, number three, and finally and only after the others have been protected, it gives tax relief. Therefore, it is a good, responsible bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

ON TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, tonight we celebrate 27 years

of title IX, a piece of legislation that was cosponsored by our dear friend the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) whom we come tonight to congratulate, along with Congresswoman Edith Green.

I have worked, Mr. Speaker, tonight with the cochair of the Women's Caucus, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), together women and men of the House, to recognize these two remarkable women and their achievements and their bringing about title IX, which began some 27 years ago.

These congresswomen planted a seed of opportunity for women that has blossomed into one of the greatest triumphs of our time. The successes of basketball superstar Nikki McCray; swimming sensation Penny Heyns; golf maestro Sherri Stein; the Williams sisters tennis phenomenon; ice hockey superstar Cammi Granat; the unstoppable softball shortstop Dot Richardson; World Cup soccer champions Mia Hamm, Brianna Scurry and Michelle Ackers; and Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to command a NASA shuttle mission which just took off on Friday. We are proud of all of them, Mr. Speaker, and we attribute their successes to title IX.

The impressive accomplishments of these women, and many more who have excelled both on and off the playing field, are not solely because of title IX. We know it takes drive, aggression, determination, competitiveness, sacrifice, true grit and a lifetime's dedication to hard work. These women are tough and they deserve to soar in their areas of expertise as they have done. But the passage of title IX, Mr. Speaker, opened a door that had been locked shut for countless decades and for countless generations of women who wanted to be challenged and pushed to new limits through athletic competition. Title IX allowed young women and girls to follow in the footsteps of tennis wonder Billie Jean King, track superstar Wilma Rudolph, and other pioneering female athletes.

It was the arduous and innovative work of the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and Edith Green 27 years ago, which we celebrated last Friday, July 23, that brought the Educational Amendments Act, which included title IX, to the desk of President Nixon. The gentlewoman from Hawaii, who is here tonight to help us celebrate her and to commend her, was both shrewd and precise in making sure that the inclusion of a few simple words would provide such a tremendous opportunity for women to develop latent athletic talents.

Specifically, the statute states, "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

The progress we have made over the past 27 years is awesome, Mr. Speaker.

When President Nixon signed this bill, about 31,000 women were involved in college sports. Today, that number has more than tripled. Spending on athletic scholarships for women has also grown from less than \$100,000 to almost \$200 million. In 1971, there was an average of 2.1 women's teams at colleges, and now that number is at a record 7.7 per school. The participation level in high school was dismal, as well. In 1971, the athletic participation of all girls in the United States was just under 300,000. Today, that number has climbed to over 2.2 million. Finally, 40 percent of athletes at Division I schools in 1997-1998 were women, a 5 percent increase from 1996-1997. Women also received 40 percent of athletic scholarship budgets, a 14 percent rise from the previous year.

Since the enactment of title IX, we have also witnessed a significant surge in women's educational achievements. In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees and 43 percent of law degrees, compared with 9 and 7 percent respectively in 1972. In 1994, women also earned 44 percent of all doctoral degrees, which is a noticeable increase from the 25 percent in 1977.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps most exciting of all, title IX has benefited millions of women, men and families who enjoy watching and playing sports. Over 40 million viewers tuned in to the final match of the Women's World Cup. That number was not only greater than any televised game for U.S. men's soccer but it also eclipsed the three-game viewing total for this year's NHL Stanley Cup. What the women's U.S. soccer team illustrated with their victory is just how far we have come as a Nation in providing opportunities for women to test their limits, excel in sports and fulfill their dreams in many more areas than women of our generation could ever fathom.

Tonight, I salute our dear friend the Honorable PATSY MINK and the Honorable Edith Green for paving the way for women to succeed in our educational institutions. And I give my most heartfelt congratulations to all of our athletic and academic achievers, who are the women of title IX.

BACKGROUND LEADING TO PASSAGE OF HISTORIC TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for this honor that they are bestowing on me this evening and I want to especially thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for taking the initiative in convening this series of comments that will be made on title IX tonight.

Today, we are witnessing the results of the formation of a concept which was incorporated in the education amendments of 1972 in a small title referred to as title IX. It is important, I

think, for this generation of young women in particular that are coming forward and experiencing opportunities which were not available two generations ago to understand what prompted the inclusion of this language in the education amendments.

In my own experience, I went to college, I fully expected to be accepted in medical school, but upon applying to at least a dozen or more institutions in those days, in the 1950s, the reply that I received was, "I'm sorry, but we do not take women into our medical school." And that was that. It was a blatant refusal to accept the notion that women could be equal in this society.

Prior to that, I had ventured into the Midwest. I enrolled at the University of Nebraska, thinking that some of my friends, male friends, were in medical school there and perhaps by being there I could have a better opportunity to be accepted. And so I enrolled for a brief period at the University of Nebraska.

Upon arriving there on campus, I found that I had been placed in a segregated rooming house with other minority women members of that college community. I was appalled at this practice, which I thought had been rescinded by laws previously. But I found myself in the midst of a tremendous turmoil on campus, which I must say I created, and within a short period of time the Board of Regents of that university eliminated that segregation and henceforth all people were treated equally and could be housed in the dormitories.

□ 2015

It was a series of these sorts of discrimination, even going back to Hawaii after I finished law school, which I went to as a second choice. I found that there were all sorts of vestiges of discrimination. I could not get a job. I always taught my colleagues currently in various places that if they had but given me a job, I would not be here on the floor of this Congress tormenting them with liberal legislation. So that is the penalty they pay today for ignoring my request for a simple job.

But coming to the Congress, I must tell you that the one person who really inspired me to get active in this field was my daughter who applied to go to Stanford University after finishing high school and was rejected because the percentage of women that had been accepted in the freshman class had been exceeded. So even in her generation, she was enduring this type of discrimination merely because she was female.

So coming to the Congress, being on the Education and Labor Committee chaired by Adam Clayton Powell, from the moment I sat in my chair as a freshman member down in the lower tier, he began hearings on discrimination and textbooks, and we hauled in all the textbooks to show that women were really being discarded. We hauled

in the Department of Education because they were issuing films on vocational education which showed women as nurses, teachers, social workers, but not of the engaging occupations like scientists or a doctor or an engineer or anything of that kind.

So as we moved into the field of education finally with the enactment of Public Law 8910 which was the first Federal aid to education to elementary and secondary schools, we wanted to make sure that with the Federal Government getting into funding educational programs that women, girls, would have an equal opportunity, and that was all we were trying to say. We were in the poverty program. And Job Corps centers were being opened all over the country, but none for the girls, so we fought to open up women's Job Corps centers, and I went down to West Virginia to dedicate the first center.

So there were many, many people that were involved in this. Edith Green was the chairperson of the Higher Education Committee. She convened hearings in June of 1970. We celebrate the year 1972 because that was the enactment, but all of this was occurring from the moment I arrived here in 1965. I have had two generations of service in this Congress. I came here in 1965, and I left in 1976 to try to get to the other body, but they did not want or were not ready for me quite at that point.

But we had a number of hearings, and Edith was always up front chairing that committee. She called this hearing in June of 1970, wanted to amend the Civil Rights Act to add the protections for women in that legislation which was not yet established.

This was all going on at the same time that all the women in the country were getting excited about the ERA. Remember the Equal Rights Amendment? So you have to put this in the context of where this Nation was at this time and all of the foment that was going on in terms of our communities and here in the Congress. And so we tried to get a civil rights bill, but the Justice Department intervened and said, no, we cannot support an amendment of the Civil Rights Act; why do you not put this measure in the education bill? And really that is the genesis of title IX. It was not a surrender, but it was a concession to the Department of Justice at that time that insisted we do this.

So finally, when the education amendments came up in November of 1971, we were able to argue all of this.

In the final comment, I must say that the tribute really and the sustenance of this legislation has to go to my daughter because on the floor when there was an attempt made to water down this legislation, I was on the floor helping to get it through. But at the moment, the critical moment of just a minute or so before the vote, I was called off the floor because my daughter had gotten into a accident,

and so I rushed off to Ithaca to see how she was. And in leaving the floor, the amendment which was a devastating amendment passed by one vote, 212 to 211, and so the next week the Speaker of the House, Carl Albert, took the floor, asked for a revote, and we captured the situation.

So she called me the other night and said, "If you're going to talk about title IX, you must mention my role in it and how your commitment to me almost caused a catastrophe." But the House of Representatives reacted and restored common sense and dignity to the debate, and so title IX lived on forever with no one ever being able to challenge it ever again.

So that is the story of title IX.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Congresswomen PATSY MINK and Edith Green who authored Title IX. Because of their vision, we all witnessed the extraordinary accomplishments of many remarkable women over the years, including the Women's World Cup Champions and Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins.

All of America and much of the world was captivated by the grace and athleticism of the U.S. Women's Soccer team. All of us—men and women alike—were thrilled by their performances and marveled at what they were able to accomplish. America was on the edge of its seat during the final game.

And, just last week, Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins became the first woman to command a NASA space shuttle. Once again, we had evidence of what women can achieve if they are given the tools and opportunities.

It was a thrill for me to join the First Lady, members of Congress including Congresswoman MINK and the World Champion Women's Soccer Team aboard Air Force Two last Monday night to witness the Space Shuttle "near" launch commanded by Colonel Collins. It was quite a celebration of the successes of women. I wish the entire crew a successful mission and a safe return home.

Tonight, we pay tribute not just to Congresswomen MINK and Green, but to all the other women in this country who have excelled at sports or the arts, at science and in business.

Congresswomen PATSY MINK and Edith Green made a real difference in the lives of girls and women, and in the communities in which they live. Without their efforts, there would likely be no World Cup championship women's soccer team today or female NASA shuttle commanders. Those two extraordinary women, through their vision and courage, gave American women the tools to succeed.

Representatives MINK and Green were the guiding spirits behind Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972—the landmark legislation that bans sex discrimination in schools in both academics and athletics. Title IX states, "No person in the U.S. shall, on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal aid."

Before Title IX, many schools saw no problem in refusing to admit women or having strict limits. But since Title IX, we have seen significant increases in women's educational achievements: In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees, compared with 9 percent in 1972; In 1994, women earned 43

percent of law degrees, compared with 7 percent in 1972; In 1994, 44 percent of all doctoral degrees to U.S. citizens went to women, up from 25 percent in 1977.

Title IX governs the overall equity of treatment and opportunity in athletics while giving schools the flexibility to choose sports based on student body interest, geographic influence, a given school's budget restraints, and gender ratio. The focus is on the necessity for women to have opportunities equal to men on the whole, not on an individual basis.

Here are just a few statistics that illustrate the impact this groundbreaking legislation has had: In 1971, about 31,000 women were involved in college sports and today that number has more than tripled; From 1971 to 1998, spending on athletic scholarships for women has grown from less than \$100,000 to almost \$200 million; In 1971, there was an average of 2.1 women's teams at colleges and now that number is at a record 7.7 per school; In 1971, the athletic participation of all girls in this country was 294,015. Today, this number has climbed to over 2.2 million; Forty percent of athletes at Division I schools in 1997–98 were women—a 5 percent increase from 1996–97; During the same year, women received 40 percent of athletic scholarship budgets—a 14 percent rise from the previous year.

In closing, let me thank, on behalf of all Americans, Congresswomen PATSY MINK and Edith Green and all the girls and women who inspire and lead us each and every day.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my women colleagues to commemorate Title IX's successes and achievements. First, I would like to commend my colleague and friend, Congresswoman PATSY MINK, as well as former Oregon Congresswoman Edith Green who authored and initiated Title IX over 20 years ago. Their contributions in support of equal opportunity for women have been invaluable.

Signed into law in 1972, Title IX is the landmark civil rights law that banned sex discrimination in schools in both academics and athletics. While the law applied to all education programs in schools receiving federal aid, it has become best known for expanding athletic opportunities for women.

Since Title IX's passage, women's participation in intercollegiate sports has skyrocketed: When Title IX was first passed, there were 31,000 women participating in intercollegiate athletics. Today, that number is over 120,000—a four-fold increase.

A recent survey showed that the number of women's collegiate teams have risen from 5.6 teams per school in 1977 to 7.5 in 1996.

Simply put, Title IX has been a smashing success for women's collegiate sports, which were virtually non-existent in the early 1970's.

But critics still like to lambaste Title IX, alleging that it's decimated men's sports or gone too far.

Let's put these tired old myths about Title IX to rest:

Myth #1: Title IX enforces quotas against men.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Title IX forbids quotas. It simply prohibits sex discrimination in federally funded education programs. That means female students must have equal opportunities to participate in education programs, including athletics. Utilizing a three-prong test, schools can show they comply with Title IX by fulfilling one of three re-

quirements, offering schools flexibility and ample room for Title IX compliance.

Myth #2: Title IX will cause the elimination of men's collegiate sports.

Title IX does not require schools to cut men's sports. Nor has Title IX ever forced a school to eliminate a men's sports program to meet compliance. Many schools have decided to cut teams in men's minor sports, such as gymnastics and wrestling, for a combination of reasons, including budget constraints, changes in student interest, alumni support, liability or risk of injury. Let's not forget that football and basketball budgets consume a whopping 69% of the average Division I-A school's men's athletic operating budget. Perhaps Title IX critics should point their finger at poor fiscal management or excessive support for one sport—not at Title IX—for the decline in men's sports.

Myth #3: Title IX has gone too far.

Despite Title IX's successes, we still have a long way to go. The fact is that women's athletics continue to lag behind men's programs. Compared to men, female athletes have only 38% of scholarships. From 1992–1997, men's athletic budgets, in Division I-A alone, increased by 139%. In contrast, women's budget increased during this time period by 89%. From fewer scholarships, to inferior athletic equipment and facilities, the playing field for female athletes is far from level. We need Title IX now more than ever.

Finally, the latest myth about Title IX is this: Title IX cannot be credited for the country's stunning success in women's soccer, because we produced the finest soccer players through independent youth leagues, outside the scope of Title IX. Let me quote a recent article in the latest edition of the conservative magazine *The Weekly Standard*: "Title IX could not possibly have had anything to do with the team's success . . . seven of this year's eleven starters . . . all joined the U.S. national squad as teenagers in the 1980s—Title IX's 'dark ages'".

Where do Title IX critics think these women played while they were college-age? They played at universities with top-notch college soccer teams. It is the heralded successes of the University of North Carolina's women's soccer team, the University of Tennessee's women's basketball team, and other Division I-A teams and their recruitment of top female high school athletes that has been a driving force in promoting athletic programs at the high school level, both public and private. In fact, in high school, the number of female athletes has jumped from 294,000 in 1971 to 2.4 million in 1995. Indeed, Title IX has sent the message to our young women that they have far more opportunities to compete at the college level and to qualify for college scholarships than any prior generation.

In closing, Title IX has helped put women's sports on the map, including swimming, gymnastics, softball, lacrosse, field hockey, track and field, basketball and soccer. But perhaps Title IX's most important triumph is that it tells our girls that they can be and do whatever they want—and that includes excelling in sports and academics.

TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, and I had other comments prepared, but I do not want to be repetitious. I am kind of going to go from the cuff and say I have been blessed to be able to stand on the floor this evening with my colleague who put into practice title IX. And I say, Put into practice, because she was the one along with her colleague, Edith Green, that moved to have this legislation come to the floor, and I just want to take a moment to say: Congresswoman PATSY MINK, thank you so very much.

I have been blessed on another occasion to have worked in the campaign of Congressman Lewis Stokes back in 1968, and to stand here as his successor is another great opportunity.

So it is nice to see history in movement.

I stand here, and I would have gone through some of the statistics that my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) went through in her presentation, but I am going to skip that. But I want to congratulate you, Congresswoman MILLENDER-McDONALD, for this evening's activity. I will move on to say in the last Olympics held in Atlanta, female athletes gave an outstanding and noteworthy performance. The last Olympics featured the first appearance of the women's softball team. The women's basketball Olympic dream team took the gold medal. The introduction of the WNBA was just 2 years ago, and I am proud to say that women in the city of Cleveland are always out in support of the Rockers. Of the 44 gold medals won by the U.S., 19 were given to women, including 5 team efforts.

In 1997, which marked the 25th anniversary of title IX, the women's addition of the National Directory of College Athletics asked people to give the most significant people or events which have effected women's inter-collegiate athletics since 1972. Of all the things presented, title IX was the one event in history that affected intercollegiate athletics.

I was proud to be able to be here in these United States when, in 1999, not only did the Duke men go to the final four, the Duke women went to the final four. That was significant for us to be able to say that.

I am almost out of time, only to say it is wonderful to turn on my television and see women athletes marketing sports products and setting the example for younger women. It is important for young women to build esteem and self-confidence, and I am pleased to say that my son, an athlete, is even proud of the women athletes that go to his school, and that is significant.

I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

I want to deviate just a little bit too from what I had prepared to say. I am

just so appreciative hearing the history and the context and the genesis and the activity that gave rise to title IX and to tell you I did not know of the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) wanting to go into medicine. But I have been reporting about her esteemed career at the University of Chicago Law School, and she says sometimes I elevated her to be first in the class, but I was told she was in the top 10 of her class. So if she had wanted to go to medicine, she would have been a great doctor, but we are very pleased that she is a great Congresswoman, a person of commitment and substance, and not only did she do something great in the 1970s in authoring title IX, but she continues to fight for equality of education for all people. And so we want to thank her for what she has done, but we want to thank her for what she is and what she represents to the future not only for women, but for men as well because she set the kind of example of what equality means.

Not only is she making people pay for their error and not letting her get into medicine, but she is opening opportunities not only for, obviously we see what happened with Earleen Collins, the first woman commander of NASA Space; just think of the opportunity that she does for people. Well, you have helped make that possible, and we celebrate the Women's World Cup champion. Just think if we did not have a title IX, that would not have been possible for all of these college women to come together with such confidence, such skill, and such poise to represent the United States at such a way.

So I want to thank you and thank our former colleague, Edith Green, who had the courage to follow you or be with you as you made history in the 1970s for all women and for all America.

Mr. Speaker. Equality. Its something that we have strived toward for years. The question is whether we will ever really reach equality.

Tonight we are honoring our colleagues, Congresswomen PATSY MINK and Former Congresswoman Edith Green who authored and initiated Title IX: the Women's World Cup champions; and Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to command a NASA space shuttle.

Mr. Speaker. All of these women must be commended for their leadership in providing equity for women and men in our educational institutions. They and especially Congresswoman MINK continue to fight for equality in education.

Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 is the landmark legislation that bans sex discrimination in federally assisted education programs or activities—in other words, women can not be discriminated against in academics or athletics.

Title IX grew out of the women's civil rights movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

During that time, Congress began to focus attention on systemic educational barriers to women and girls.

And because of this legislation, women have come a long way.

For American colleges and universities, women now constitute majorities in college enrollment and completion, and are the majority of recipients of bachelor's and master's degrees.

The proportion of women graduating from college today is now equal to that of men.

By 2006, women are projected to earn 55% of all bachelor's degrees.

In 1994, women earned 34% of all U.S. medical degrees, compared with 9% in 1972.

In 1994, women earned 43% of law degrees, compared with 7% in 1972.

In 1994, 44% of all doctoral degrees to U.S. citizens went to women, up from 25% in 1977.

There are more female faculty members now than in 1972, with women constituting 37.9% of faculty members at two-year public colleges, and 19.5% at private four-year colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that we are celebrating the success of Title IX is that on July 10, 1999, the Women's World Cup Soccer victory reminded us about how important it is to have the protections for women that we now have.

But this victory was about more than the game and the win. It was about female athletes, sports, and equality.

In 1971, about 31,000 women were involved in college sports and today that number has more than tripled.

From 1971 to 1998, spending on athletic scholarships for women has grown from less than \$100,000 to almost \$200 million.

In 1971, the athletic participation of all girls in this country was 294,015. Today, this number has climbed to over 2.2 million!

These statistics are overwhelming. We must keep on fighting this battle.

Equality. We must remember that this is what we want to achieve. We're on our way. This victory simply reminded us of that.

I want to thank Congresswomen MILLENDER-MCDONALD and CAROLYN MALONEY for bringing this important occasion to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating how far women have come in both academics and athletics, and congratulate our colleague PATSY MINK for her leadership and vision.

THE SURPLUS; WHO IS IT FOR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, over the next several weeks what this great country of ours is going to hear is an important debate. And that is what to do with the money generated by millions of American taxpayers who get up to work every single morning, some of whom work two jobs, the husband and the wife work as well. So, you have a husband and wife working two or three jobs a week, sometimes working 6 or 7 days to put food on the table, to pay the mortgage or to pay the rent, to make that car payment, to put away for your child's education, college, law school or med school.

Whatever hopes and dreams you have for your family, you are getting up every single day to fulfill your dream. And at the end of the week, when that

paycheck comes, a big chunk of that comes right here to Washington. And the American people have been working so hard in the last several years sustaining economic growth that we really have not seen in recent times and generating a surplus here in Washington.

Now there are those here in Washington who think it is all their money. And there are those who want to spend every single dime on their favorite projects or programs. And then there are those who feel that, you know what our job here is to represent and do what is right for the American people, for those taxpayers who generated this surplus. And when we do things like address adequately Social Security and Medicare and education and protecting the environment and strengthening our national defense, then we can believe that those things are right. Then we decide, well, what is left?

Right now Washington is projecting a \$3 trillion surplus. Now for whatever those assumptions are worth, the bottom line here is there is money that is going to be left on the table.

□ 2030

It is important for the American people and the people back home where I am from in Staten Island and Brooklyn to understand the core principles that are going to really drive this debate.

There are those of us who believe in personal freedom more for the American people, and there are those who say we need more government control. There are those who want lower taxes, because we believe in the American spirit that when we reduce taxes and allow hard-working people to keep more of what they earn, it drives economic growth, it creates more jobs, and we reinforce what we all tell and what we all believe in, and that is that in this great country, one can follow their dreams if given the chance. On the other side are those who want higher taxes.

There are those of us on this side who want limited government because we believe when government gets too large it infringes on our freedoms and liberties, and there are those on the other side who feel that government is just not big enough.

Then there are those who want economic growth as opposed to those who want bureaucratic growth, who feel that the decisions made in our communities across this great country are not good enough, but if we grow our bureaucracies here in Washington to have faceless and nameless bureaucrats make decisions for ourselves, our families and our communities and our schools, our police departments, that somehow, that is a better approach to government.

Finally, there are those who believe in the creation of more jobs in the private sector that has driven this engine to generate this surplus, and then there are those who believe we need a little bit more redtape to stifle innovation, to hurt small businesses, to add

unnecessary rules and regulations that actually reduces the number of jobs it could create.

Mr. Speaker, over the next several weeks there are going to be those who say everything imaginable to allow the American people or force the American people to take their eye off the ball. I believe in the American people, the common sense that they will prevail in the end, and not only that, but that we will place our faith in their wisdom and judgment to know that when there is too much money left here in Washington, too many people want to spend it. I say when we take care of Social Security, Medicare, strengthen our national defense and protect our environment and improve education, what is left over we send back home to the people who earned it, to strengthen freedom, to strengthen liberty, and continue our path to prosperity, not only for families that I represent so proudly and humbly in Staten Island and Brooklyn, but all across this great country. I suspect that when we have this debate, the American people will understand who is right.

TITLE IX AND ITS EFFECTS FOR OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to honor the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for her good works on Title IX and everything else she does here for women and children and families and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, last Monday night I had the chance to see in person the effects of Title IX firsthand. And let me tell my colleagues, I was impressed. Last Monday night, a number of my colleagues and I flew to Florida with the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team and with the First Lady to watch the space shuttle launch. While we were there, we met with female astronauts and we met with other women involved with the space program.

Of course, I do not have to describe the American women's soccer team to anyone that is listening here tonight or anybody in this Chamber. I cannot imagine that there is an American who has not heard of their skill, their power, and their success and does not hold them in awe.

These women, these young women are the products of Title IX. They are the perfect example of the importance of Title IX. They are an example for every female player on every women's sport team in the Nation. But less well known are the benefits of Title IX for women like the women astronauts that I met.

Title IX says that no person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded or discriminated against under any educational program or activity receiving Federal aid. So it is not just sports. Be-

fore Title IX, most institutions of higher education, as the gentlewoman from Hawaii told us, refused to admit women or have strict quotas on the number of women admitted. Since Title IX, however, there have been significant increases in women's educational achievements, particularly in what were traditionally all-male fields like science, engineering, math, and technology.

So while we were gathered there the other night to celebrate the very real achievements of women on and off the playing field due to Title IX, we must also be aware of how much there is left to do. According to the National Science Foundation, the low participation of women in math, science, and engineering is a true and serious national problem. Too many girls lose interest in science and math during elementary and middle school and refuse to take, or fail to take advantage of these courses that they will need to prepare themselves for technical and science degrees, and technical and science high-paid careers. Too few women earn college degrees in science, engineering, math, and technology. Even though women make up slightly more than 50 percent of our population, they are less than 30 percent of America's scientists.

My colleagues may be asking me, so what? Is that some national problem? Well, the answer is absolutely yes, this is a big problem. A big problem for employers, a big problem for women as future wage-earners, and a huge problem for our Nation as we compete in the global marketplace. Quite clearly, there is no way for America to have a technically competent work force if the majority of students, females, do not prepare themselves and study for science, math, and technology careers.

That is why I have introduced a bill to help school districts encourage girls to pursue these technical careers. My bill is formally entitled, *Getting Our Girls Ready for the 21st Century Act*, but it is known as "Go, Girl." Go, Girl will encourage a bold new work force of energized young women in science, math, engineering, and technology. Go, Girl funds programs in elementary and high school to encourage girls to study and pursue careers in those fields.

Today, women are big winners on the soccer field, and that is with the help of Title IX. Now we need to get Title IX and Go, Girl into the classroom to make more girls and their future employers winners by preparing girls for careers in science, math, engineering, and technology.

Mr. Speaker, Title IX says, no person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded or discriminated against under any educational program or activity receiving Federal aid. Our job now is to encourage all girls and young women to take advantage of Title IX opportunities and like the American soccer women and the women astronauts, become all that they can be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAYNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the *Extensions of Remarks*.)

THANKS TO TITLE IX, WOMEN CONTINUE TO MAKE HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking and applauding our cochair, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and our covice-chair, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for putting together this Special Order and all of my other women colleagues for joining us this evening.

I want to join also in thanking the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and former Congresswoman Edith Green for their foresight in championing and protecting the rights of women and young girls against gender discrimination within the educational system of this country, particularly in athletics; and I want to also thank all the other Members of Congress who have continued to fight to end discrimination of all kinds in this Nation.

Title IX was important legislation, and its impact is immeasurable. Its very intent was the impetus for ensuring that today's heroes would become role models for the young girls of today and those yet to be born. Access to equal opportunities in education has made it possible for all of us to be here as representatives in Congress. Thanks to those like the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) who came before me, when I was fortunate to have been accepted into medical school, unfortunately, we were still less than 5 percent of our class. Now, women at George Washington University School of Medicine, my alma mater, make up more than 50 percent of any incoming class.

In the past few weeks we have also had outstanding examples of what Title IX has done for women in the United States since its implementation. As many have said, on Friday, Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins made NASA and U.S. history as the first woman to command a space shuttle; and of course, we are all still basking in the success as well in the recent victory of the women's soccer team this month at the World Cup, which indicates what significant progress continues to be made each and every day.

More women are enrolled in college and universities than ever and are pursuing postgraduate and professional degrees, a key factor in the swell of women-owned businesses across this country today. One of the most obvious benefits of Title IX is the impact it has had on women's participation in intercollegiate athletics, and our young

women are determined to make their mark in the sport arena.

In my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, educational and athletic equity has long been practiced, and we have produced a multitude of successful players in various sports, as well as in other fields. One of our long-standing track and field success stories in the Virgin Islands is Flora Hyacinth who is one of 24 Virgin Islanders participating in the Pan American games in Winnipeg this week, and we wish her well. Ms. Hyacinth also set a world record in 1986 for the triple jump while attending the University of Alabama, and just last year won the long jump gold in the Venezuela games. She and Ameerah Bello, another winning track and field athlete from the Virgin Islands, are both qualifying members of the Virgin Islands Olympic team.

Also making her mark in women's track and field is 16-year-old Rodneysha Pitts, who recently ranked among the top 10 U.S. high school students while attending school in Indiana briefly last year.

At the college level, Vania Blake, a volleyball player from the Virgin Islands at North Carolina A&T, was named Athlete of the Year and MVP of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference for her school; and, Felicia James, the MVP of the All Star basketball games at Grambling State University in Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we have all had many shining examples of young women who have been able to succeed in their respective areas because of the freedom and opportunity Title IX provides. One only need attend a WNBA game here in the District or in any city to truly realize the impact that women's sports has had on up and coming female athletes nationwide; and it is here that we can also be proud of the precedence that Title IX has set, for without it, entities such as the WNBA would not have been possible.

While we still have a long way to go in ensuring equality across the board for women and all Americans, we can look onward with pride as young women like Venus and Serena Williams dominate the world of tennis and cheer on all of the women who are charting a bright future in women's sports.

I look forward to the day, Mr. Speaker, when there will be a women's soccer league, baseball league, and any other league that we choose to break ground in. The sky is the limit for our young women in sports, in business, in politics, and now in space. I am proud to be here this evening with Congresswoman MEEK and my other colleagues and to be able to work with them, to continue to open doors for women and for all Americans.

APPLAUDING THE AUTHORS OF TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have all benefited from the historical perspective that has been given to us this evening. It is certainly my honor to be able to associate with the remarks of my women colleagues to honor my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Even more exciting for, I hope, all of us who have had the pleasure of being on the floor, was to see her energy in recounting this historical recollection of the challenges and the battle, if you will, of what she had to overcome to bring us to this point. I particularly enjoyed the gentlewoman's emphasizing that she was a woman and a mother. When it came to her daughter, her daughter was first, but she did and made all of these sacrifices because she wanted to see young women who were coming up behind her to have the opportunities that she might not have had.

So I want to join my colleagues, and I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her vision and leadership, along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for giving us this opportunity to come and honor the existence of Title IX, the landmark legislation that bans gender discrimination in school academics and athletics, and to applaud the authors of this legislation.

□ 2045

I might say to my good friend and colleague, the vote did not count, but the vision, the words, and fight that she puts in place were really what counted. We thank her for that. Might I say to former Congresswoman Edith Green, our appreciation as well. Their leadership ushered in a new era of appreciation for women in sports in academia.

The Speaker has been listening patiently. As many of us proudly like to talk about our children and home towns, let me say that I am from Houston, Texas. I want to share a personal moment of pride, or two personal moments of pride; one, when the WNBA Comets won their first championship, I had the pleasure of being in the arena.

Mr. Speaker, I am not embarrassed to say as a slightly older woman than 21 years old, I cried, I cried, because for the first time I saw women in a competitive sport, with the excitement, the energy, but also to see the community, men and women, cheering for women sportspersons, not because it was basketball, which seems to have taken the world by storm, but because women were engaged in a competitive sport, and we all were cheering.

Might I say that I have a young daughter, a young woman for whom I had the pleasure of being a mother on the sidelines, watching her play basketball and engaging my husband and my younger son in what she was doing wrong and what she was doing right. How many of us had that experience 20, 30 years ago, when I relished the oppor-

tunity to participate in sports in my high school and in college, and Mr. Speaker, I simply was not asked to participate. Yet, I have the opportunity to sit along the sidelines and applaud my young daughter, and watch my young son engage in debate and cheering his sister along.

I stand to congratulate the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and Ms. Edith Green for what they have made and what the future holds. I also congratulate the Women's World Cup team champions. Their historic win a few weeks ago over China was watched all over the world, and certainly serves as a testament to the importance of Title IX.

Might I apologize to my constituents who invited me to be a guest speaker, and unfortunately, there was a television in the room, and I asked everyone to stop, stop the program so I could see the final minutes of the World Cup, and watch the women bring it to a close and slap 5, and I congratulate them as well, many of whom are from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. No, I am not from North Carolina, but my daughter attends that school, and the soccer women made me aware of that when we visited with them, and joined them in traveling to NASA last Monday to see off and to offer words of congratulations to Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to pilot the space shuttle. She is flying above us now.

I might congratulate her because I think the charge of Title IX helped to propel women all over the country and the world to do great things. We saw her go off in space last Friday, but I was with my colleagues, both colleagues who were here on the floor, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) to travel down to Florida to see her off.

Let me quickly finish by saying each of these accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, have served to remind us that only 27 years ago there was no Title IX, and women were still second-class citizens. We have come a long way from those days when only men were expected to be legislators, excel in sports, and fly in space.

This is truly a great day for women in America and all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one thing, it is vital that we do not pit the value of women's sports against the needs of men's sports. I want to say today, tonight, this evening that what the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) did and Congresswoman Green, both of them in the United States Congress, was a great thing. Let us not turn it into a wrong thing or a bad thing by pitting those two needy efforts against each other.

I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, as I come to a close, there is much that we need to do. I will cite the number of women that got medical degrees, and 43 percent of law degrees and doctoral degrees, 44 percent. All of this I think is

generated by the energy and enthusiasm when women get into a competitive mood.

But we have a long way to go, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we need more women CEOs. We need to address the question of pay equity, more engineers and scientists. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to elect the first woman president of the United States of America.

So I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and former Congresswoman Green, as authors of this energetic legislation. They dreamed and we believed and we accomplished. Today we honor them for their work, and our commitment and challenge, Mr. Speaker, is that we go forth to do better, to do great things, and to create equality for men and women in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the Women's Caucus in honor of title IX, the landmark legislation that bans gender discrimination in school academics and athletics. I also wish to applaud the authors of this legislation, Representative Patsy Mink and former Congresswoman Edith Green. Their leadership ushered in a new era of appreciation for women in sports and in academia.

I also stand to congratulate the Women's World Cup Team champions. Their historic win a few weeks ago over China was watched all over the world and certainly serves as a testament to the importance of title IX.

Finally, I would like to offer words of congratulations to Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to pilot the Space Shuttle.

Each of these accomplishments serve to remind us that only 27 years ago, there was no title IX and women were still second class citizens. We have come a long way from the days when only men were expected to be legislators, excel in sports and fly into space. This is truly a great day for women in America and all over the world. It is vital that we do not pit the value of women's sports against the needs of men's collegiate sports.

Since title IX passed, we have seen that there have been significant increases in women's educational achievements. In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees, 43 percent of the law degrees, and 44 percent of all doctoral degrees. In 1972, the numbers for professional degrees were in the single digits (9 percent for medicine and 7 percent for law).

In athletics, we have also seen more opportunities for women in intercollegiate sports. Institutions now must ensure that there is adequate athletic financial assistance, accommodation of athletic interests and abilities of women, and that the opportunities and treatments afforded to sports participants must be equivalent.

Some other program components include providing access to equipment and supplies, opportunity to receive academic tutoring, medical and training facilities and services, adequate support services and publicity. These benefits are some of the ways institutions ensure that sport participants receive equivalent treatment.

We know that title IX has had an important impact on women's sports. We have seen the success of the Women's National Basketball Association and the Women's Soccer Team

as evidence that access to these programs in college is crucial to professional development.

I am proud to stand here today to applaud this important legislation and these women who have blazed the trail of achievement for other women. These athletes will inspire a new generation of girls to engage in sports. CEOs, pay equity, and, yes, we have yet to elect this Nation's first women President.

I am grateful to serve in Congress with Representative PATSY MINK, one of the authors of this legislation. She must have only dreamed that we would be here today in honor of the great accomplishments of women due to her work. Today, we honor your work and the work of other women who have fought hard to give more opportunities to women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TAX RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, the discussion about tax relief has been brought to this body tonight in very eloquent terms. What I would like to do is to talk to one of my colleagues, one in particular, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), who is headed this way, to discuss the practical side of tax relief.

As I go about my district, and I have seen the discussions brought about, both the pros and cons, I am perplexed by the fact that people are saying we do not need tax relief.

I want to state at the front of this that there are three reasons that I can see for tax relief that is needed at any time, and especially at this time.

One is to support the economy. We have surpluses now that have never been so great. They were not obvious in that the projections 5 years ago, even 3 years ago, were that we were going to have deficits, a continuation of deficits. But we have surpluses now.

The economy is growing from a lot of different sources. There is a lot of money in the stock market. It is over 11,000 now, which is unheard of. When I came in 1992, I think it was right below 3,000. So it is a factor that we need to support the economy so that it does not go down, so that we can keep the surpluses. Tax relief is one way of doing that.

Secondly, we must shrink the government. We are doing a good job. It is not simple. We are doing it over a lot of objections. We are doing it through elections after elections, when people are saying, from the other side, you do not care about this, you are mean-spirited, you are this or that. But we have started bringing the cost of government down.

There is one sure way we can do that. That is to stop the blood supply or stop the money from coming in. Tax relief will provide that, and it will also help and give freedom to the people who work.

We have too many people who were finding their families in disarray. They are not spending enough time at the breakfast table, the dinner table, the supper table. That is because they are having to work two jobs. They keep talking about let us bring costs down, but our inflation is under control.

We have a lot of different factors that are being mentioned, but the big problem is that we are just taxing people to death.

This particular tax relief package includes something called estate taxes. That is something that I hope, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) gets here that we can talk about in more detail. But we have to support the economy, keep the surpluses in place, shrink the government,

stop spending so that we will have smaller government, less bureaucracy. It will be less burdensome to the individuals, and give freedom to the people who work so they can have choices for their families, because we must build the families back.

The excuses that we have seen in the past have been, well, let us wait until we balance the budget. That seems safe for those people who want to keep taxes at a high rate. That seems safe because the deficit was projected for years and years and years. I think in 1998 the deficit was projected at \$377 billion, and we came in, or maybe these are not the accurate figures, but we came in at like something like \$72 billion for a surplus, a swing from a deficit to a surplus.

So it was safe for people to say, we won't have the taxes, those people who believe taxes are the way for government to operate. They were saying that is fine, let us just keep it there. Let us keep the taxes there until we can eliminate the deficit. Well, we have a balanced budget, we have eliminated the deficit, and we are progressing in that way. We need to keep it.

Also we heard that social security was a factor, we must protect social security and Medicare. That has been mentioned time and time again. At one point the administration proposed that we put 62 percent aside on social security. We have said, no, before we do anything, before we have tax relief, we have more spending, we are going to put 100 percent of the social security aside.

That comes from years and years of using social security for the wrong reasons. Not one year has one dime been set aside to protect social security until we have passed the lockbox, not one year. The trust fund has been used for all kinds of things. It has been used to finance the Vietnam War, to finance spending programs, to finance the government getting bigger. It has brought about more and more deficit, more and more debt, and greater and greater government, and less and less control of our lives. But we have taken care of that with the lockbox. We are taking care of social security and Medicare.

Now we are told, let us wait until the debt is paid off. Here comes another excuse, another delay for these people who want taxes. Now what we have done in this bill that is coming up is we have plugged the tax reductions into whether the debt is coming down. So if the interest on the debt is not reduced in certain years, then the reductions in the income tax or the 10 percent across-the-board tax will be delayed 1 year.

So then we are faced with the fact that we are going to benefit from our keeping the debt down because the interest will be lower, and from that point, if we spend too much, we will suffer from it, so we are going to have a good and a bad consequence.

I just think what we have as the problem and the thing that is per-

plexing, as I have stated, and I see that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is here. But what I am saying, some people, when they hear the word "taxes," they say, yes, that means I am going to get something. Some people, when they hear "taxes," they say no, I am not in favor of this because somebody is going to take something away from me and take my incentive for working.

What I would like to discuss in this time we have here with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is the pros and cons of it. We happen to have appeared before this body one other time, when we discussed another issue, and we had a friendly discussion. People called my office and said, why are you so friendly with somebody on the other side? He got the same kinds of calls.

I would just like to propose to the gentleman that maybe he could make an opening statement, and we can just start talking in front of the American people. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. First of all, I want to congratulate my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, because what it should establish to the American people is that a Republican and a Democrat can come to the House floor and engage in debate and talk about the real issues that we are involved in, and not the partisan or political issues that so often we get involved in in our debates on the floor.

So I really welcome this opportunity to share this hour with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY), and what we want to do is not necessarily talk about a particular tax bill, whether it be the House version of the tax bill, the Senate version, or the President's version. I think what we really want to talk about with the American people is sort of representing the average American sitting there in the living room, trying to come to some conclusion as to what their government should be doing right now in regard to fiscal policy and tax cuts that will have great ramifications on their family, on their community, and on the future of not only this country, but indeed, the world.

The proposition that I would argue tonight, if we were going to put it in debaters' terms, would be, resolved that the Congress of the United States take no action this year in regard to affecting the revenues as represented by the Tax Code adjustments, as suggested by either the House, the Senate, or the President.

That proposition that I would argue is based on several things.

First and foremost, anyone in economics today agrees that although we can project out what the income will be 10 years from now, 20 years from now, or 30 years from now, and sound very intelligent about it and very informed, and I am sure the gentleman

from Arkansas or I could give that argument, but the fact of the matter is that there is a common parlance term for that, and I will just give the initials, it is BS.

The fact of the matter is, we have a hard time in our system, and with this complex economy of the United States and of the world, to even project out what is going to happen 3 months or 6 months from now. If anyone doubts me, listening to this, if we knew what was going to happen 3 months from now, we would all immediately run down to the markets, whether it would be the stock market or the bond market, buy options, and retire 3 months from now, if we knew where it was going, because clearly it is going to be reflected in those markets.

□ 2100

The market is a day-to-day operation. It really is an intelligent operation as a free market. It indicates what people's, in varying degrees, their analysis has made them come to a conclusion. There are winners. There are losers. Some people buy thinking a stock is going to go up. In fact, it goes down; and they lose. Some people sell when they think the stock is going to go down; and in fact, the stock goes up.

That is what a free market is. That is how markets exist. To my knowledge, there is no one that I know that can tell me even what is going to happen tomorrow on these markets, no less 3 months from now, 6 months from now, and clearly not 5, 10, and 15 years from now.

It almost appears to me to be the height of conceit that anyone at any office, elected or otherwise, or in any position in this country that would have the audacity to make these projections.

Now, why is that important? Well, when we pass tax laws, they are not easily reversed, particularly if we pass a tax law and reduce taxes and therefore reduce revenues.

We have seen over the course of the history of the last 20 years, only four major tax packages enacted in law. This will be our fifth. So the earliest life turn is about 4 years, 5 years.

In 1981, we saw a tremendous tax reversal and where, in the Reagan administration, the concept of Reaganomics, supply-side economics, said that basically we can hold what we committed when we ran for office. When Mr. Reagan ran for office, he said, "I will balance the budget. I will increase expenditures for military and defense. And I will cut taxes." So he cut taxes, balanced the budget, and spent more for defense.

Now I argued at that time to myself, I did not see how one could do that. I did not see how one could cut revenues on the one hand, spend more money for the defense on the other hand, and balance the budget.

Well, Mr. Reagan was right in two instances. The two instances were an act of this body can, in fact, cut taxes, and they did in 1981, almost \$900 billion.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, was that with the help of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI)?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately, I was not here. But our predecessors were here. I have to say that that tax cut probably was not passed only by the Republican majority, because, as the gentleman from Arkansas knows, in the House, as a Representative, there are a lot of people pressing us for tax cuts. So it becomes a very popular political thing to do. Oh, let us get on the bandwagon.

As a matter of fact, some of my friends that talk about that occasion call it the Christmas tree. Everybody had something to add on and give a gift to somebody back home or some industry or some group of people they were interested in.

Anyway, what they did is they made this tremendous commitment to cut taxes and then, and I think rightly so, although I was not in favor of it at the time, I will quite frankly tell my colleagues that they did make an increase in the expenditures for defense. It was sizable; over the course of that decade, probably a trillion dollars for defense.

Now, looking back with the hindsight and the ability to see what happened in 1989 and 1991, the Wall falling and the destruction of the Soviet Union as we knew it for 50 years of our lives, we could say, well, that was the expenditure, a greater defense expenditure to win the "Third World War" without fighting it. Because, in fact, we forced in a poker game, if you will, the Soviet Union to try and match the American capacity to spend for defense.

They were great accomplishments. Fine. We brought the Soviet Union to dissolve into new states. Hopefully, over a period of time becoming more democratic and making the world more stable. We had a military that was fully equipped to handle the needs and protect the interest of America and, indeed, the free world; and it was accomplished.

But in that price, it did not only cost us that trillion dollars for defense expenditures, it cost us an increase from 1980, when Mr. Reagan became President, of a debt of the United States, not a deficit, a debt of \$800 billion to, at the end of his administration, it was about \$3.5 trillion. It was a \$2.7 trillion increase in the debt of the United States in that period of time.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, is the gentleman from Pennsylvania attributing that to the fact that there was tax relief given?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we cut revenues, and we spent more money, and we ended up in debt. What we did is we financed America, as opposed to financing it by revenues and tax revenues, we financed it by going into debt. I mean one can justify that. And we probably can do that in the future to some extent. But the question is how far do we want to go into debt long-term in the United States, and who does it benefit, that debt, and who

does it really hurt? I think we should talk about that debate.

But let me set, if I can, the standard. So we went through this, that administration, and then we came into the Bush administration. Just prior to the Bush administration, the second tax bill was passed. In a way, I did not support that tax bill in the House, but I voted for it finally when it came out of conference, and I did it really for a simple reason.

It was Bill Bradley who was the United States Senator at the time, and his argument was, I thought truthfully correct, that we should try and make our tax policy reflective of the free market, to free up decision making by corporations and individuals of where they make their investments and where they put their money, not based on tax avoidance that is a policy set by the legislators of tax policy, but that supply and demand of capital and funds be freed up to operate in the marketplace.

That is one of the reasons we did away with the difference between capital gains and earnings. They were taxed at the same rate. That was the first time that occurred probably in 50 or 70 years in tax policy in the country. It was good policy.

Our problem is the Christmas tree in 1986 when we brought the levels of tax rates down, even Mr. Reagan had advised to come down no lower than 35 percent on the top bracket, no, the Christmas tree makers in the House and the Senate were not happy. They brought it down to 28 percent and 14 percent on the low side.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania hit this thing twice. The Reagan tax relief bill brought supposedly 19 to 20 million jobs into the economy that did not exist before. Is it possible that the fact that the spending kept going up is the reason why we had the deficit and not the tax relief? In other words, is it true, is it not a possibility that the tax relief actually played toward reducing the debt by employing more people, increasing the number of taxpayers, and bringing in more revenues in that fashion?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, that argument applies to the present day. There is not any doubt in any mind, we are at \$5.5 trillion, if we want to become greater spenders, I think the economic theory indicates that we can spend ourselves into higher revenues and greater job creation. It is just we are going to end up with a much higher debt. That is really the issue I am much interested in. Where do we want to stop, or what do we want to do with this accumulated debt?

See, in my mind, I can certainly justify debt in fighting a war. I would not care, if America were in world war, if we have to double or triple the debt; and, oftentimes, that is when debt did occur that way.

Mr. DICKEY. Even taking Social Security surpluses or Social Security income?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKEY. Okay.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If we want to have to go to war to defend this country, we have a win-lose situation. If we lose, we do not have a Constitution, we do not have Social Security, we do not have America.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I can go along with that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. So that type of risk of that nature, that justifies almost any fiscal policy.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, before we really get into some of these other things, it is clearly a situation where the gentleman from Pennsylvania believes that we ought to keep the taxes where they are, we ought to have more control in the Federal Government. I want less taxes and less control in the Federal Government. Is that not a fair statement?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, not quite, but close, Mr. Speaker. Close. Here is what I want.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to characterize what he thinks I want and what he wants and see if we can get the differences set out.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Arkansas wants to try and give back to the American people what he may perceive as excess funds coming from them. I think that the gentleman somewhat has lost faith in the political system, both the Congress and the Presidency, or even the enlightenment of the American people; that if this money, all the surplus money practically that will come in or is projected to come in over 10 years, if it is not returned, it will be improperly spent.

I think I look at it as two things. I think it is the first time in my lifetime that we have an opportunity of reversing this tremendous trend of increasing the national debt of the United States, and, in fact, we can start paying it off. I think that is fiscally responsible and that is the fiscal conservatives' position.

Now, that is not to say that, at some point, we should not examine a tax cut because, certainly, if we knew the excesses of revenues were so great that we could pay the debt off in a couple of years, that would be great. But we all know that \$5.5 trillion is not going to be paid off in a couple of years. Even the President's most optimistic view is that he could retire the public debt of \$3.6 trillion in 15 years. But that again is assuming all these assumptions work out.

I have been around the House long enough to know, every time I hear my friends on either side of the aisle, including my fellow colleagues on this side of the aisle, when they start making an argument based on all of these assumptions, seldom do these assumptions work out. I would like to err on the side of conservatism, fiscal responsibility.

I think two things, too, on the side of the gentleman from Arkansas. Last

year, I voted against what I thought was an irresponsible resolution, although proposed by a very good friend of mine, and I really like the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT). The gentleman from Oklahoma said, let us pass the resolution to do away with the income tax code by the year 2001.

I checked the other day. That was in June of 1998. Some 219 of my fellow Republican colleagues voted yes, and about 208 of my Democratic colleagues voted no, and it passed.

The whole theory, if we go back to that argument that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) and those proponents made that day was that this gigantic out-of-control tax code has got to be finally shot and put to rest, given a decent burial. The only way to do that is pass a resolution that, on a certain date and a certain time, it is dead. It is repealed.

Some of us argued that is awfully nice to say that, but if we do not have something to replace it, it is really injurious to the decision makers and business and in our communities and in our families of what are their obligations going to be 3 and 5 years from now.

The whole purpose of passing a tax statute rather than year to year is to give people the benefit to project their needs and how they can respond to the obligations that they may have from the government.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, what I see in this body, and I have only been here 7 years, is that we do not do a whole lot until the end of the day, we do not do a whole lot until the end of the week, and we do not do a whole lot until the end of the term.

Now, I am defending my vote to say that we are going to terminate the tax code at a certain date because that is how we operate. We are not going to operate without a deadline, and we probably will not do it until 6 months or a year until that deadline comes up.

Now, of course, it did not pass. The law did not pass the Senate. It had not been signed into law, so those people listening do not have to worry about it. But I am just saying those of us who are so concerned with the spending and the fact that, if we let up at all, we are going to continue to spend, and the Internal Revenue Code and Internal Revenue Service is one way that we spend.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, let me try and respond to the gentleman from Arkansas. I think two problems are at fault there, two fundamental errors. One, why do we want to get rid of the tax code? Because it is so lengthy, so complicated. Most Americans are so fed up with the time they have to expend preparing their taxes and business people preparing taxes and the expense of preparing taxes that they wanted to simplify it. Yet, just the other day when we voted the tax cut, we added 560 new pages to the tax code. We made it far more complicated. That will spurn about, oh, another 10,000 pages of

IRS regulations to implement our changes in the law. Why did we do that if we were serious about changing it?

Mr. DICKEY. Because we are trying to stimulate the economy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I could agree with that.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, what we have is we have a structure called the IRS, which is horrible. It favors the rich. It favors the people who have got enough lobbying strength to make exceptions. The poor working stiff is out here, who does not have the shelters, has to pay a lot more than the rich people.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Arkansas agrees with that. But then if we look at the tax code we just passed, two-thirds of the benefits go to the upper 9 percent, and a third of the benefits go to the richest 1 percent of our population. So that certainly is not taking care of the 91 percent that only got a third of the tax benefits.

□ 2115

But let me give the second problem.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not agree with what the gentleman just said, by the way, but go ahead.

Mr. KANJORSKI. By passing the tax code right now, and by taking this supposed, assumed, money that may come in, the gentleman has now limited the funds that would be necessary to make intelligent new tax policy. Because if we want to make a simplified tax policy, we will not be able to project what revenues will come in from that tax policy for several years. Now, if we had a surplus, we could take that risk at that time.

Further, we know that Medicare and Social Security do need adjustment, do need support. Why should we not take this surplus and make sure that Social Security and Medicare are secure 25, 30, 40, 50 years from now?

Mr. DICKEY. What does the lockbox do? The lockbox theory says we will not touch the money from Social Security and Medicare. We are going to protect it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Matter of fact, let me talk about the lockbox.

Mr. DICKEY. Did the gentleman vote for the bill?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No.

Mr. DICKEY. So what the gentleman said was let us keep Social Security available for spending like we have had before?

I do not want to be argumentative about it, but that is the way the gentleman's vote could be interpreted; is that not correct? Is that not a fair interpretation?

Mr. KANJORSKI. What we are doing now is taking all of the surplus from Social Security, but it is a little amount, from beyond Social Security, and we are actually doling it out by reducing taxes over assumptions that cannot be correct over 10 years.

Mr. DICKEY. Reducing what taxes, now, income taxes or FICA, Social Security?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Corporate taxes. All kinds of taxes. Not Social Security.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Those people who want to tax, those people who say on August 7 of 1993, or whenever it was, voted for the largest tax increase that this Nation has ever had, also want to keep Social Security available for spending. Is that a fair corollary; or is that a corollary with the gentleman?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No. And I appreciate that the gentleman could have heard that assertion made sufficiently long enough by some people that are trying to sell a political agenda, but it is really not correct.

Mr. DICKEY. Those two things exist with the gentleman, do they not?

Mr. KANJORSKI. There were two fundamental things that happened. In the Reaganomics of the 1981 tax cut and the 1986 tax cut, we never got to balance the budget. The Presidents, both Reagan and Bush, never sent to the Congress a balanced budget.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Every year it was out of balance. So they just recognized the right to live in deficits.

Mr. DICKEY. They spent more.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Spent more than was coming in; therefore, we were building up the debt in the United States.

Now, there were two heroic acts, two heroic acts, one performed by a Republican president and one performed by a Democratic president. And I may not have ever said this to the gentleman before, but I was here in 1991, and I remember when President George Bush met with the leadership of the House and the Senate and tried to get our fiscal House in order in 1991; and they brought back a proposal that I voted against and which did not carry in this House, a budget proposal.

They brought it back a second time. I voted against it, and it failed in this House. And then they called a group and said what is it going to take to pass a budget? And I quite frankly said we are going to start cutting this deficit and, therefore, the debt of the United States.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman think we can cut deficits better by cutting spending or increasing taxes? What is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Cut deficits?

Mr. DICKEY. Does the gentleman think we can cut deficits better by increasing taxes or by cutting spending? Which is better, if the gentleman has to make a choice between the two?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, it depends where the taxes are going to come from and what amount they are and who we are taking it from.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, was it better that we increased taxes back under George Bush or cut spending? Which was the better circumstance?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Very clearly, because we were already in deficit, how

could we not increase taxes? And we were already cutting spending. That was the beginning.

Mr. DICKEY. Spending was going up every year. Spending went up every year.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That is absolutely true. The budget of the United States has gone up every year. The population of the United States has grown every year. And every year from now until America becomes less than 50 states or has a decrease in population as a result of a catastrophe our government will grow. We will always have more Americans year to year.

This whole argument of people saying, oh, they are spending more this year than they did last year. Of course we are, because this year we have 8 million more Americans.

Mr. DICKEY. I just happened to think, and of course I wanted to get into this discussion, and I wanted someone who might be watching and listening to us to see if there is a difference. Those things that the gentleman is talking about, the historical things, what I think is that if we stop spending, we do a better job of cutting the deficit than by increasing taxes.

I think if we increase taxes, we are decreasing the chances of reducing the deficit. That is from a businessman's standpoint. I am a businessman. I have had to meet payroll, I have had to borrow money, I have had to pay interest, I have had to control inventory, I have had to pay insurance premiums and pay taxes. I have had to balance all of that and then across the counter still please the customer. And from that standpoint I am saying this, that I believe that cutting spending is 10 times better than increasing taxes if the goal is to cut the deficit.

Mr. KANJORSKI. My answer to that is, depending on what spending we are going to cut and depending on whose taxes and why we are going to increase them.

I will give the gentleman an example. Today, people that have lived in this country with the existing market that has doubled or tripled their net worth in the last 6 years, even though they pay 1 percent more in taxes than they did 6 years ago, I doubt there is anyone who would trade their net worth in today, if they are in the upper 5 percent income bracket in this country. They will certainly not do that.

Mr. DICKEY. If they are in the stock market, I agree.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Not only the stock market. Compare it to salaries. I heard Senator HARKIN talk today about the last 20 years. If we took executive salaries, CEO salaries in the United States and the minimum wage, and we tracked them to give the minimum wage increase the same percentage as the corporate executive increase was, the minimum wage today would be \$40 an hour.

And, obviously, I am not saying that is bad. That is a business decision. That is the people who own the stock

and control these corporations, and these are people that help create great wealth in this country. So I am not opposed to that.

But let me go back to spending. If the gentleman makes the argument that all spending is the same spending, I do not agree with him, and that all spending costs money and could drive us into debt, I do not agree. There is intelligent spending and stupid spending, quite frankly. Intelligent spending, and I will give the gentleman an example, the GI Bill of Rights. When that was instituted by this Congress in 1945, it was a novel new idea that all these young American men and women that were going to be returning from all over the world into the private sector were going to be upskilled and uptrained and educated. It cost a great deal of money in the first 4 and 5 years of the GI Bill of Rights. But where is America today as a result of that expenditure? That trained, educated, skilled work force developed the computer, developed space industry.

Mr. DICKEY. Just for the sake of time, there is actually plenty of things that we agree on that spending is perfect for, like the highways and the judicial system and the military. My gosh, the gentleman and I will not argue about that. But what I am saying is just cutting spending. I am not talking about which spending we cut. If we reduce cost, and I think this administration has done that, if we reduce cost in certain ways, we reduce the number of employees and those things, that has a greater impact.

Mr. KANJORSKI. And we have.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me finish. That has a greater impact than increasing taxes. Now, the same thing, if we cut spending and reduce taxes, then we have a double benefit.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely. There is no question about that.

Mr. DICKEY. Does the gentleman have confidence that we can continue to cut spending? Has the gentleman felt the pain of our cutting spending in this House?

Mr. KANJORSKI. What I guess I am arguing is a simple proposition: the gentleman is an average American family, and the gentleman is making \$400 a week and the gentleman has debt of \$10,000, credit card debt, auto debt, whatever, and suddenly the gentleman's employer asks him to work 50 percent more hours a week, instead of 40 hours a week can the gentleman work 60 hours a week and be paid the same amount or double time. The gentleman has an opportunity to make \$200 a week or \$400 a week more than the gentleman ever had.

Now, the gentleman does not know how long that is going to last, but right now the gentleman can say, gee, it is going to last for a month or so because my employer really needs this work done because he has sales to meet. Now, the gentleman meets around the kitchen table or the dining table on Sunday with the family and

the gentleman says, I think I am going to have 20 weeks of this 50 percent more time, so, therefore, I am going to make either \$200 more a week for 20 weeks, which is \$4,000 or \$400 more a week for 20 weeks, which is \$8,000. We are going to have \$4,000 or \$8,000 more to spend in this family in the next 10 weeks.

Now, who in their right mind would say, okay, Daddy, let us go on an around-the-world vacation? No, an intelligent mother and father would say, oh no, we are going to take some of that money and pay down our credit cards, or pay off the car, or take some of it and put it in the bank for education for the kids' future.

There is no real difference here. What we are arguing about or differing on is we are just like that family. For the last 40 years, 30 years, since 1969, we have been increasing our debt every year, and particularly in the last, oh, about the last 20 years, since 1980 it has been exponential in its explosion. Now, I can justify why we did it, but now we are in prosperous times. Our unemployment rate is 4.2 percent. Most people cannot even believe it could get down to that level but certainly cannot see it falling much below that.

Mr. DICKEY. So the gentleman is saying we should spend more now?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, I am saying we should start paying off that debt.

Mr. DICKEY. Are we not doing that?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No.

Mr. DICKEY. Of course we are. Fifty-one billion dollars was paid off on the national debt, we are talking about non-Social Security debt, in 1998, and \$122 billion is projected for this year.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That is right.

Mr. DICKEY. Now, we are 7 months in it, and the gentleman may say, well, the projections will not work. The gentleman probably did not believe in 1998 that we would be paying off \$51 billion in the national debt.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I absolutely believed it.

Mr. DICKEY. So interest rates are going down. This tax package, that I voted for and the gentleman voted against, says that we will not have the tax decreases unless the interest on the national debt goes down every year.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, no.

Mr. DICKEY. Every year. It will extend it one more year for 10 years.

Mr. KANJORSKI. It is really a false claim. If the interest rate jumps up to 10 percent from the 5.6 percent it is at now, that immediate next year—

Mr. DICKEY. Not interest rates, the interest payments.

Mr. KANJORSKI. The interest payments.

Mr. DICKEY. The interest payments on the national debt, if they do not go down, the tax reductions do not take place. Does that take care of the debt problem?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, because the gentleman is talking about interest, not the size of the debt. The interest payments are depending on what the

interest rate of that year is. I can grow the debt and have lower interest rates.

Mr. DICKEY. But does not the lack of dollars that the gentleman pays in interest free up more dollars for paying the national debt off?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, not unless the gentleman has the money to pay the debt off. Right now we are not going to have that. We are, quote, taking \$1 trillion over the next 10 years, if all assumptions are right, that would have gone to the debt. And instead of letting it go to the debt, we are sending it back to the American people. But that means that an interest rate on the Federal debt, assume it is 6 percent because that is where it is about, that means \$60 billion every year more will have to be paid ad infinitum until that is reduced.

Mr. DICKEY. It is \$358 billion that is projected for next year in interest on the debt, just to get a figure.

Mr. KANJORSKI. What I am saying is, why can the gentleman not join me and say, look, we are working extra time, our economy is as prosperous as it can be, let us form a policy to get rid of this debt while we can? We cannot pay the debt off when the economy is in recession or depression. If we do not pay it off when we are in prosperity, where is the fiscal hope of ever paying it off?

Mr. DICKEY. Here is the answer to the question. In 1961, President Kennedy had a reduction in the capital gains taxes and tax revenues went up. In 1996, we had a reduction in capital gains, tax revenues went up.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKEY. It does not necessarily always happen. The gentleman and I have discussed this before.

□ 2130

But it is a possibility that the tax reductions are going to increase the amount of revenue.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely. I tell you right now, if you reduce the capital gains tax in 1999, you will have more revenue in 2000. Why? Because everybody that has had their stock go up 100 percent or 200 percent in the last 4 years, they are not going to be stupid. They are going to sell and pay less taxes than they would this year and take a benefit, so you are going to get that up-front tax revenue.

Mr. DICKEY. I want to talk about one other thing. Let us talk about the estate tax now. In this provision, and I know you agree with some of these things, but in this provision of estate taxes in the bill that we just passed, it provides that there is going to be reduction of the estate tax over a period of time to zero.

Now, I want to see if you agree with this. After someone pays the Federal income tax and after they pay capital gains tax if they had capital gains, after they pay tax on savings on their dividends and after they pay excise taxes, fuel taxes, income taxes and State taxes and then sales taxes and all

other taxes that I have not named and someone is left with something after all of that, is it good that we tax that that has been accumulated or saved from all of that effort at the rate of 37 to 55 percent at someone's death?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No and yes. Like all things, there are not simple answers. I wish there were.

Mr. DICKEY. Are you in favor of reducing the estate tax?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I think the estate tax certainly should be adjusted for small businesspeople, for farmers and for people that are in net worths of even a couple of million dollars.

But let me ask you this. Assume that an individual has a net worth of \$100 billion and assume that person has a life expectancy of 45 years, and if there is no estate or income tax, what do you think that person's accumulation of wealth will be and the next generation of that wealth in perpetuity?

What am I suggesting? If you apply that formula to just Bill Gates, and I hate to cite Mr. Gates because he has made a great contribution to America, but I am sure he is already thinking that because he has indicated that he does not want to keep that in a family. But if you did apply it, probably by his 75th or 80th birthday, he will have a net worth value, at just growth of 10 percent a year, of \$2 trillion.

Mr. DICKEY. What is your question?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Without an estate tax, that growth will constantly compound ad infinitum. So that if you carried that to the extreme, you get to the Benjamin Franklin example, that all the money in the world would be owned by one person.

Mr. DICKEY. That person has to die for this thing to work. For this estate tax to apply, Bill Gates has to pass on.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, no, no. Because his children are not going to have an estate tax.

Mr. DICKEY. We do not know about the children.

Mr. KANJORSKI. My argument is, I do not know how they would do, but I think that is open to a very strong argument.

Mr. DICKEY. What you are saying is you just want to stop the accumulation of wealth no matter how hard you work, nor how much talent you have or how much you contributed to the society?

Mr. KANJORSKI. It all depends. If we want economic kings or czars in the world.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think that is going to happen. Let me give you an example.

A young man, younger than I am, younger than we are, came to this city and told the story of what it was like in a small town in my district where he owns a bank, he owns three banks, his family does, a car dealership and some timberlands. When his grandmother dies, he is going to have to borrow money and pay \$20,000 a month to pay the death taxes that are going to be on her estate. Now, when his dad dies, her

son, it is going to be more than that, because hers will come into his and then it comes down.

Now, here is what will happen to them. This may be something where you are in favor of. They will have to sell. They cannot expand, first of all. If they cannot meet the debt payment, they are going to have to sell off their interest. Is that what you say is the benefit of the estate taxes? Or are we stifling growth, reinvestment and further employment by doing this and forcing these people to pay \$20,000 a month to the Federal Government for 10 years?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I understand what you are saying. That is a very tough event, but I would say there are probably 5 or 6 million Americans listening to us, all of which would not mind inheriting three banks, an auto dealership and timberland and most Americans do not have that when they pass on. They generally pass a mortgage on the house and debt on.

Mr. DICKEY. But they are going to have to buy it back from the government.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If we intelligently debate this as we are doing tonight, there is a solution to that problem. Part of the problem of estate taxes, which I agree with, we should find a way of taking artificial inflation out of an inheritance tax. There is no reason to penalize someone who has owned a piece of property for 40 or 50 years and a portion of its present value is represented by inflation and not real growth.

Mr. DICKEY. You are talking about indexing now?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Sure. We can index that. Secondly, we can certainly raise the exemption a great deal so that the hundreds of thousands of Americans that have become millionaires in the last 6 years under the Clinton administration do not lose what they have earned over those years. I can understand that. We want to encourage people to contribute and to make wealth, but what we do not want to do, it seems to me, and I would like to argue this point, I think we have to find a mechanism that one great man can come along in a family and then for the next 200 years of his survivors, contributing nothing, can end up being the wealthiest people in the world. I do not think we want to do that.

I heard another figure today that impressed me and why we have to think about this. It is not pressing today that we think about it, but as Americans, to have public policy. The wealth of three Americans, three of our wealthiest Americans today, are greater than 600 million people living in the world today. Three people have the accumulated wealth of 600 million.

Mr. DICKEY. I have seen that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. How is this country going to imbue its free market system and its democratic government around the world if people think there is no way that we have equality? That

is not to say we should confiscate this wealth.

Mr. DICKEY. I think where you and I differ on this—

Mr. KANJORSKI. You and I are lawyers. You know the rule against perpetuities. What is the rule against perpetuity?

Mr. DICKEY. You cannot keep passing it on from generation to generation to generation.

Mr. KANJORSKI. You are claiming by inheritance to do away with the rule on perpetuity in families. If you cannot do it in a trust estate.

Mr. DICKEY. You can do it with intent, though. You can bypass the rule against perpetuities. You can exempt it from applying. It can happen. But vesting is what is so very important in that. I am sure this does not mean anything to anybody.

Mr. KANJORSKI. We know that Benjamin Franklin put an accumulation, I do not know whether it was \$100—

Mr. DICKEY. Excuse me. We are talking about two different things. I think I am listening to you from the standpoint of what you want to do is just share the wealth.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No.

Mr. DICKEY. What I want to do is try to protect the economy. The estate tax is harming the economy.

The estate tax is harming the economy. Do you agree with that?

Mr. KANJORSKI. The estate tax?

Mr. DICKEY. The death taxes are harming the economy. In my situation, this family knows what is needed for those three banks in small town Arkansas. They know what the dealerships can do and what they cannot do. If they have to sell to someone, say, from Omaha, Nebraska, who comes in there, we will not have the same productivity. We will not have the same progress.

Mr. KANJORSKI. All the adjustment necessary can be made there and should be made there after an extended debate, that we think about why we have inheritance tax policy affecting the very largest accumulation of wealth down to the very minor accumulation of wealth. Certainly I agree with you.

Mr. DICKEY. We agree on that. Lead me into this other area. We are using the death tax to share the wealth. How does that help our country?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, we are not. I certainly do not want to use the death tax to share the wealth. What I am disturbed about is those people who without some way of either encouraging them to be philanthropic with their assets or taxing them, we go on in perpetuity accumulating wealth like a vacuum cleaner.

Mr. DICKEY. What happens, though, in the estate plans, and you and I have seen them, where to avoid estate taxes, all of these things go into charitable trusts or charitable institutions so that there is no tax.

Mr. KANJORSKI. And that is very serving to the economy, to have this type of philanthropic activity.

Mr. DICKEY. You say it is serving the economy?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Sure.

Mr. DICKEY. It is hurting our ability to pay off the national debt.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No.

Mr. DICKEY. So taxes are not needed to pay off the national debt? What we are doing with the death tax, we are driving those assets into tax-exempt entities.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Let me ask you a question. Would you agree that the economy of 1999 is probably the best economy that you have ever lived in in your lifetime?

Mr. DICKEY. I think historically it is, do you not?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I agree.

Mr. DICKEY. I claim credit for it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Would you join me in the wish that we could perpetuate this economy as many more months or years as possible because it is increasing wealth for everyone in our system?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, sir. I think to do that we need to reduce taxes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That is where we differ. I want to get to that point. Right now we are at the top level of our production of commodities, of materials. We are at about 90 to 92 percent of absolute capacity to produce. That is about the highest level we have been in in our lifetimes. There is not much productive capacity left in our economy.

Mr. DICKEY. That is what they have been saying for the last 2 years.

Mr. KANJORSKI. We are down to 4.2 percent and right now if you go to some employers or some workshops, you find the level of performance of employees has fallen because we are tapping the very minimally trained people in our force, which is very healthy, but sometimes services and activities fall as a result of that because we are getting people in the workforce that never worked before. That means we are at maximum capacity of production and we are at maximum employment. Now, what a tax cut does—

Mr. DICKEY. Wait a minute. There is an exception to that. That is, our tax in relationship to the gross domestic product is the highest that it has been since 1946. It is 20.1 percent. Does that relate to your discussion?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, it is always going to do that as long as we keep running deficits, as we have run deficits. Next year if the deficit does not go down and it goes up, you are going to need more interest for the debt. It will keep going up. Every \$100 billion, you are going to need \$6 billion more, every year ad infinitum.

Let me give you an example what we are all worried about. I join guys like Alan Greenspan. I cannot say he favors or believes in everything I believe, but we do agree on one point. He says this is not the time to cut taxes. This is the time to pay off the debt.

Mr. DICKEY. When is the time to cut taxes from your standpoint?

Mr. KANJORSKI. From my standpoint clearly not until we reduce the increase in debt back to the Reagan years. I would like to go to zero.

Mr. DICKEY. How can you go to zero faster by taxing?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Because that money is a revenue in and it buys bonds.

Mr. DICKEY. But you just got through saying it is perfectly reasonable to expect that by reducing the taxes we will increase revenues.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No. Artificially for a year in capital gain, you will get more capital gains revenue in because it will exacerbate the market.

Mr. DICKEY. I see what you are saying. I did not understand your position. I disagree with it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Your problem is and what Mr. Greenspan argued to us the other day in his appearance on the Humphrey-Hawkins report, is that at some point when this economy starts turning down, you are going to have to provide a mechanism to encourage it to return from recession to recovery. That is when you cut taxes. So we may have to go into deficit spending when that happens. But why would you spend and put more money out for consumption when we cannot create any more product and we do not have any more people to employ?

So what we are all worried about is through this type of fiscal policy, you are going to have more money chasing the same amount of goods and the same amount of people that are available and start to exacerbate inflation. We have a tremendous impact on fiscal policy in the policy of taxation. But we have an independent body downtown called the Federal Reserve, and they control the monetary policy of this country.

Basically Mr. Greenspan says that if you shove more money out there to buy more goods and there are not those more goods, the price of those goods are going to go up and the cost of that labor that is limited is going to go up, you are going to cause inflation and we are going to have to raise the interest rate to counter, with monetary policy, that inflation. Let us look at what that does.

Mr. DICKEY. That stops the tax decreases from going into effect if that happens. We have got the mechanism to control that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. The mechanism on taxes, first of all, only apply to the change of the rate on personal income tax, not to the estate tax, not to any of the others. They are set. Once they are passed they are set. But also every time the Federal Reserve would increase interest rates by 1 percent, it costs the American government \$55 to \$60 billion. Every 1 percent. To see interest rates go up to 8 or 9 percent, as has happened many times in your lifetime and mine, if that were to occur—

Mr. DICKEY. Not with balanced budgets though, I do not think.

Mr. KANJORSKI. We have not lived in too many balanced budgets.

Mr. DICKEY. That is what I am saying. 1969 was the last balanced budget.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If we enact this tax code, most of us, and I think when I say most of us, most of the economists agree, we will be out of a balanced budget in a very short period of time.

□ 2145

Mr. DICKEY. Okay, let me ask my colleague this; let me change the subject a second.

Marriage tax penalties; we right now are encouraging people not to live together if they love each other but not to get married. We are also, in this code, encouraging school bond construction by being more favorable on the taxes in that area.

Does the gentleman agree that tax reductions should solve other problems like trying to encourage people to get married and also by bond construction for schools and so that the local authorities can build more schools?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I just spent 6 days a week ago traveling across America with the President, and I went to Hazard, Kentucky; I went to the delta of Mississippi; I went to East St. Louis in Illinois; I went to the Indian tribes of South Dakota; the hispanic community of Phoenix, Arizona; and to Watts in Los Angeles. And I went there trying to find out what policy the government could pursue to help these people, and I came away with a lot of observations.

One observation is regardless of how many people tell us that this economy has helped all people, it has not. This economy has been very helpful to the upper 5, 10, 15, 20 percent of the American population. We are part of that population.

Mr. DICKEY. Of course that employment now, unemployment is at an all-time low for an all-time period of time.

Now I do not understand what the gentleman is saying now.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, to some of those people, they are living in poverty level even though they are working poor. They are working poor.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, we are doing that to the military. I know we are doing that to the military.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Yes.

Mr. DICKEY. The military is existing on housing and food stamps in some instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI. The Indian tribes of South Dakota, 75 percent unemployment. The unemployment rate in the delta of Mississippi was twice the national rate. But the explanation given by a lot of the officials, I think, I believe is the education level in the State of Missouri is 50 out of 50 States. And they said that is what we need before we can get people hired.

Mr. DICKEY. Did the gentleman say Missouri or Mississippi?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mississippi.

Mr. DICKEY. Okay.

Mr. KANJORSKI. In order to attract new businesses in there they need a trained work force and an up-scale work force, and we have got to have the capacity to do that.

What I came away realizing is, one, all people are not benefiting from this prosperity; two, there are distressed areas in this country that need help; and, three, where we agree:

We can use, sometimes, tax policy to encourage where money goes, and I would much rather see capital investment in the private market made in these distressed markets where the government has anything to do with the decision-making and is not part of it.

Let us utilize the great magic of the free market. It is a tremendous tool.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, cannot we do that? I mean does the gentleman agree that tax credits and tax incentives are helpful?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely, if they are proper. But they are not proper if we have favorite special interest groups that come down here.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, what about education savings accounts where one can put in not \$500 but \$2,000 a year?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely. If we can afford to do that properly, there is no question, and I think that type, I think that is where it is going, to the right place.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, that is what is in this bill.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Sure, we know there are those little segments in the bill. But our problem is look at what we reduce, the corporate tax rate, the individual tax rate at the highest level to 1 percent. Let us look at what we did to the special interest groups. But we do not want to argue this bill.

Look, we are never, as we know.

Mr. DICKEY. The gentleman is right about that. That is correct, that is correct.

Mr. KANJORSKI. As we know, no two Members in this House will ever agree 100 percent with what is in a spending bill or what is in a tax bill. This is the House that comes to order with compromise, and we have to accept things we do not disagree with.

Mr. DICKEY. There are a lot of people in my district who I talk to and who support me, are saying the things that the gentleman is saying, not in the depth that the gentleman is saying, but they are saying not now, maybe later.

I do find that the people who say, give the economy the augment like we want it or a little bit more fervent than the people who say we just do not feel right about it.

But that is why I am listening to what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I think our risk is I do not know how low the unemployment rate could go, but it is as low now it has ever been in my lifetime. I always used to think 5 percent was full employment. As a matter of fact, I think Humphrey Hawkins said 6 percent is full employment, matter of Federal statute. Well, 1.8 percent under that.

I always felt that I never expected us to have what I think is a Clinton recov-

ery of 1993 built on the Bush sensible tax increase of 1991.

Mr. DICKEY. Now, wait a minute. The gentleman thinks both of those tax increases have brought us low inflation, lowest unemployment, low interest rates and higher productivity.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Yes.

I am going to join the gentleman some day in sponsoring a statue to George Bush because he did have, he gave up his Presidency to do the right thing.

Mr. DICKEY. Why does the gentleman think he gave up his presidency?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, he knew that he made the promise no new taxes.

Mr. DICKEY. Because American people do not like tax increases.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Look, we started out this discussion knowing. I do not know of a Member of Congress who likes to vote to increase taxes. They will always vote to cut them. It is not hard to get numbers to cut. I do not think any American likes to pay taxes unless they think it is absolutely necessary or could be used for a good purpose.

I think the gentleman is hearing out there from his constituents, the same thing that I am hearing. We do not want wasteful spending, and I agree with that. But we want measured, intelligent spending, and we want to pay down the debt.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me tell my colleagues this:

I have enjoyed discussing this with my colleague who has not smiled a whole lot. I have been trying to smile over here, but it has not been coming across. We must continue this sometime. Thank you so much.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I think it helps us all.

NO FAVORED NATION TRADE AGREEMENT FOR CHINA UNTIL CERTAIN PROMISES ARE KEPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago last month, China's Communist dictatorship sent its tanks and armored carriers crashing through the pro-democracy protest in Tiananmen Square in Beijing. Hundreds of innocent protesters were crushed to death, hundreds more were mowed down by machine gun fire, hundreds more were arrested and executed. The men and women who gave their lives for freedom in Tiananmen Square in Beijing and those who are still languishing in Chinese prisons are in many ways the heirs to the legacy of our Founding Fathers. In the days leading up to their slaughter, they quoted Jefferson not Mao. Their source of inspiration was not Mao's Little Red Book, but our Statue of Liberty.

We all witnessed the lone man blocking those oncoming tanks. For that individual at that time, freedom and democracy were ideals that were absolutely worth dying for.

Tonight we stand here in remembrance of that man who stood in front of the tank and the countless other Chinese people who chose Thomas Jefferson over Mao Tse-Tung. We stand here in consolation with their bereaved mothers and fathers who still cannot find their daughters and sons, whether they disappeared in Tiananmen Square or whether they disappeared in Tibet. But most of all, we stand in defiance to those who would continue to sacrifice the freedom and democracy for the Chinese people on the altar of free trade.

Wei Jingshang, a democracy activist that spent nearly two decades in Chinese prison for his political beliefs once told me that American corporate executives, not Chinese spies, not Mao Tse-Tung, not the thugs who run the slave labor camps, but that American corporate executives are the vanguard of the Chinese Communist Party revolution in the United States. He is right. There is no issue before Congress that has lobbied more heavily than giving the People's Republic of China continued trading privileges, and while virtually every Nation, other Nation in the world retains Washington lobbyists to do their bidding, China relies on the business community to do its heavy lifting in this city.

Every year, when we debate most favored nation status for China, every year when we debate this issue, American CEO's stream into Ronald Reagan Airport seeking special favors for the world's worst abuser of human rights. They are helped by former government officials, high-ranking American former government officials that know how the machinery of our government operates including former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, former U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills, and former U.S. Commerce Secretary Mickey Kantor.

For those who do not agree with my assessment, I recommend you contact the editors of Fortune Magazine who, this fall, are sponsoring a 3-day business trip to Shanghai. This trip including dinner with President Jiang Zemin and a luncheon with Henry Kissinger will outline and thank these American business corporations, these American corporate executives, for their work in China. After the conclusion of their gala in Shanghai, many of these corporate CEO's plan the next day, October 1 of this year, to go to Beijing and celebrate with Communist party leadership the 50th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, the 50th anniversary of the victory of communism in China.

Just think about that. American corporate leaders, some of the wealthiest, most successful, most well-paid corporate leaders in the United States will travel to Beijing and stand and sit at

Tiananmen Square with leaders of the Communist Party revolution celebrating 50 years of communist rule in China and celebrating frankly, maybe implicitly, but frankly celebrating the deaths of those hundreds and hundreds, maybe thousands of demonstrators for democracy that were following Thomas Jefferson, not Mao Tse-Tung.

But much of the equipment on display as they sit in Beijing and watch this parade in Tiananmen Square, that much of the equipment on display on October 1 of this year they know has been financed by China's enormous bilateral trade surplus and incorporated stolen U.S. technology. Apparently, that is of little concern to America's most prosperous and well-paid CEOs.

After all, these CEOs and their Wall Street allies do not seem to care much if the shelves at the Lorain, Ohio, K-mart are lined with goods manufactured by Chinese prison labor. Their lawyers in Washington do not care much if Chinese workers are imprisoned for trying to form unions. And these well-paid CEO's do not seem to care much that some of these companies that they contract with in China are paying Chinese workers 12 cents an hour, those that are being paid at all, not to mention those that are in Chinese slave labor camps and working for these American companies.

But it should bother all of us that after 10 years, that 10 years after the slaughter at Tiananmen Square, American citizens, some of our wealthiest corporate leaders that benefit from living in a free and open society, will be actively celebrating communism in China and, at the same time, actively celebrating the demise of democracy in China, the harsh realities at the ongoing genocide in Tibet, the continued arrest and torture of democracy activists, the proliferation of nuclear technology in North Korea, the forced abortions conducted by Chinese Communist leaders, the persecution of Christians and Buddhists and all religions in China; none of this seems much to matter to the leaders of our corporate community in this country.

To this I say the most effective way to toughen our relationship with China is to deny it special trading privileges. Every year, many of us have prodded the Republican leadership in this body to force China to improve its behavior before giving it preferential trade status. China buys, we buy from China approximately \$75 billion worth of goods from that country every year.

China buys from us about \$12 billion worth of goods. We sell more to Belgium with 1/120 of the population of China, we sell more to Belgium in a year than we sell to China. We have a \$65 billion trade deficit. We sell \$75 billion, we buy \$75 billion worth of goods from them. They buy \$12 billion worth of goods from us. These trade benefits give Chinese Communist dictators the billions of dollars. Last year, it was nearly 60 billion, the billions of dollars and the commercial technology needed

to modernize the People's Liberation Army.

Yet each year, many of the same Members of Congress who are the loudest in their criticism of the Clinton administration's China policy vote to give Beijing preferential trade status. Mark my words. After the vote on Tuesday on MFN, after this Congress will again support the morally bankrupt position of the Clinton administration and the Republican leaders in Congress, many of those Members on the other side of the aisle after voting to give preferential trade status to China will be yelling and screaming about the President's wrong position admittedly, but wrong position on his whole China policy.

Yet when it comes time to step up to the plate tomorrow and vote on most favored nation status, I hope they would come over and join those of us on both sides of the aisle that realize how corrupt this whole process is.

Mr. Speaker, what we need to do before granting China special trade privileges is condition their behavior on something other than a whole series of broken promises. I am weary of continued Chinese Communist promises that they will behave, that they will play fair, that they will stop the human rights abuses, that they will stop the forced abortions, that they will stop the child labor, that they will stop the slave labor.

□ 2200

I would like to quote his mentor, Soviet leader Lenin when he said: "Promises are like pie crust, they are made to be broken."

Mr. Speaker, I asked the administration, I asked the Republican leadership in this body, I asked the American business community, so strongly supportive of MFN for China and so strongly supportive of World Trade Organization entry for China immediately. I asked them to step back and let us see if China can behave for 1 year, just only 1 year. We should demand to see if China can stop its human rights abuses for only 1 year. We should demand to see if China can stop using slave labor for only 1 year. We should demand to see if China can stop child labor if only for 1 year, and we should demand that China stop threatening Taiwan before receiving another dollar from U.S. consumers, for only 1 year. We must not give China special trading privileges until we see proof that its Communist rulers are capable of abiding by the rule of law. That is all we ask, Mr. Speaker.

Let us wait a year. Let us not give China Most Favored Nation status. Let us not give China these trading privileges until they can prove to the American people and to their workers and to their citizens and their country that only for 1 year they can act like most of the rest of the world that is integrated into this world economy and the World Trade Organization and throughout the world economy. Just ask for 1

year, if China could behave itself, if China could join the League of Nations, to join the community of nations and act like the rest of us, who treat workers decently, who do not engage in human rights violations the way that China does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) from the neighboring county, Cuyahoga County, who has been an active participant and leader in this fight against Most Favored Nation status for China.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a pleasure to serve with the gentleman in this Congress and to call him neighbor.

These economic issues which the gentleman speaks of are issues which affect both of our constituencies, constituencies which in many cases share the same economic concern, the same jobs, the same factories, the same concerns about their family survival. I think it is fair at this moment to ask, why are we renewing Most Favored Nation trading status to China when our trade deficit is so large that it is costing jobs in the United States?

Why would we continue to allow Chinese exports to flood the American market when American exports to China are puny in comparison? Why does this Congress vote on bills to make trade free when, by far, the most important part of the economy does not even involve foreign trade at all, but domestic product and consumption?

A great disservice is done to the American people when so much time and effort is spent by the Congress making trade free for the corporations because it is at the expense of American residents, American workers, and American consumers.

Now, contrary to what one might think by listening to those who support MFN for China, a global free trade agreement, international trade is a drag on the American economy. Most Favored Nation status or "normal trade relations," as it is being called today, means that the U.S. gives to China the same exact trade status that it would give to a tiny country or ally. But MFN with China costs more jobs than it creates. Moreover, foreign trade is such a small part of the economy, that to make policy on the basis of what promotes foreign trade is to make the tail wag the dog.

Now, how many of my colleagues know that U.S. exports to foreign countries in 1998 accounted for only 11 percent of the gross domestic product? Imports account for slightly more than that. What that means is that 76 percent of the gross domestic product is made in the United States and consumed in the United States.

To make our economy healthy, we have to promote the health of the domestic economy. We have to promote higher wages and a monetary policy that promotes full employment. But

MFN for China undermines the domestic economy. By far, the largest component in our trade with China is imports. By 1998 we imported \$71 billion of goods from China. That was \$57 billion more than the exports we sent to China.

The U.S. pays China \$6, Mr. Speaker, for every \$1 it earns in exports to China. Trade with China puts a drag on the U.S. economy, and that leads to lower employment and lower wages for Americans. Indeed, American exports to China represent only a tiny fraction of all American exports to the rest of the world, about 3.6 percent. But imports from China represent a much larger proportion of everything America imports from the world, around 13 percent. Imports from China do about 4 times more harm to the U.S. economy than exports to China do good for the U.S. economy.

Furthermore, America imports more from China than any other single country. We consume about one-third of their exports. That should give the U.S. powerful leverage over China. That is because China would know that when the U.S. demands more democracy in China, more respect for human rights, better environmental protections, that the biggest customers continued business rise in achieving those goals. Is that what the U.S. does? No.

The policy of this administration and the Congress has been to give up the economic leverage the U.S. has. The imbalance is so obvious we should ask the obvious question: If MFN for China by far benefits China at the expense of the United States of America, why are we giving MFN to China at all? Because large multinational global corporations lobby for it. Those corporations are seeking to promote their own business and profits. They see China as a good place to do business.

When multinational corporations talk, many in Congress listen. When they talk about MFN for China, they are lobbying for the Chinese Government. The Chinese have not given up their leverage, and they use access to the Chinese market to influence the corporations to lobby the Congress for MFN for China, and here we are.

Soon Congress will debate on this floor disallowing Most Favored Nation trade status for China. Giving the status is bad for the U.S. economy. It is bad for American workers. It is bad for American consumers. But it is good for Chinese manufacturers and a handful of U.S.-based multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I will be here when that debate comes to the floor to urge my colleagues to vote for the American economy and not for essential interests. Our steel, our automotive, our aerospace industries which form the pillars of our strategic industrial base are being threatened by this avalanche of imports from China. How are we going to protect the America of the future if we do not take a stand and demand once and for all that this country

insists on having a strong trading policy which protects American jobs and protects the American economy?

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for this opportunity to address the Congress, and it is an honor to work with him on this issue, to work with such fine representatives as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) and others who are so dedicated to protecting the future of the American economy. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) very much for his leadership on this issue and recognize that several other Members will be joining us, and I thank my colleagues for their involvement.

On one point that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) said that is especially noteworthy is that the rules we set for China are the same rules, if we give them Most Favored Nation status, as it unfortunately is always the case, the same rules we set for a tiny country. They are also the same rules we set for free countries, and if we look at what makes China so attractive to western investors, the subsidies given by the government, the slave labor that the Chinese use, the child labor that the Chinese use, their ban on the right to freely associate, that workers can bargain collectively, their restriction of movement of workers so that workers are unhappy and cannot move somewhere else; all of these features that are attractive for American western investment in China is what should disqualify them from Most Favored Nation status.

The fact is, when China pays 12 cents an hour to workers, when they do not follow any environmental rules, when they do not treat their workers well, when they do all of the kinds of things that violate international labor standards, they are not competitive with the rest of the world; no one can compete when workers are treated that way. That is one reason that steel workers in the United States are at a disadvantage and auto workers and all the people that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and I represent in northeast Ohio and so many others in this institution represent, when the Chinese do not play by the same rules as everyone else, whether it is slave labor or child labor or 12 cents an hour wages, not to mention forced abortions and religious persecution and all kinds of human rights violations, when they do not play by those rules, clearly, there is no reason we should give them trade advantages so that they can continue to take advantage of other countries around the world.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, if I may make this point for a moment, and I know we have other colleagues waiting to speak here, and I certainly want to yield to them, but the point that arises

here is that China has an industrial policy, and its industrial policy is providing China with a kind of national cohesion, so that they can have sustained economic growth.

Now, a lesser concern of China is political freedom. Think about that. Think about what that means. So as multinational global corporations make China a place to do business, China cares less about political freedom, they flood the United States with all of these imports, creating this huge deficit, so we are exporting jobs from a free Nation to a nation that does not have a democracy, and they are sending back imports here, displacing jobs of people who work in a democracy, thereby helping to create a condition where we are actually paying for the destruction of our own democracy. They are targeting what are our central industries in this country: electronics, machinery, petrochemicals, automobile manufacturing, steel, aerospace, construction. So I say to the gentleman his point is well taken.

We have a joint concern here when it comes to looking at what this trade policy does. But we have two points here, and one is that the United States trade policy is wrong, but we need an industrial policy which will help to focus a trade policy which is fair; and right now, it is unfair and Most Favored Nation status for China would compound the unfairness. I yield back, and I am grateful for this chance to join my colleagues.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to Congress's foremost leader on this issue, who has a greater understanding of U.S.-China policy than any other Member of this body, and who has led the charge against Most Favored Nation status in large part because of her belief in fair play and human rights, the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for calling this Special Order tonight. I am pleased to join my colleagues, the gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and others I know who want to participate to talk about the issue of Normal Trade Relations with China, formerly known as Most Favored Nation status with China.

□ 2215

I guess I will start off with that point. The name has been changed, and not to protect the innocent.

This policy, our U.S.-China policy has had more names. It has been called constructive engagement, strategic partnership, and now, most recently, principled purposeful engagement with our eyes wide open. Can Members imagine, that is what the administration calls its policy towards China.

It has to remove all doubt that our eyes are wide open on this policy, lest someone think that we must be turning a blind eye to what China is doing

in terms of trade, proliferation, and human rights, because indeed, only by turning a blind eye could one formulate this purposeful, so-called principled engagement with eyes wide open, because the policy has been a complete failure.

There are three areas of concern, as my colleagues have pointed out: Human rights, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by China, and the trade issue.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) very eloquently opened his remarks by talking about the young man before the tank. He talked about the young people who echoed the words of our Founding Fathers. Many of those, indeed, hundreds of them, are still in prison for speaking out freely for democratic reform 10 years ago, at the time of the Tiananmen Square massacre. Thousands of people are in prison in China for practicing their religion. Hundreds of thousands are in reform through labor camps for reeducation by the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, just this past week over 10,000 people were arrested by the Chinese for practicing Falun Gong, their belief system, and whether we agree with it or not, it is not up to us to decide on someone else's religion or their spirituality, but it is inappropriate, it is wrong, and we as a country should be speaking out when any country detains 10,000 people for wanting to freely associate and believe in something.

I will go into that a little more if I have time, but having touched on the human rights issue, and I will talk about the proliferation issue in a moment, I want to talk now about the trade issue.

What has distinguished this coalition that we have to oppose MFN for China, or now called normal trade relations with China, again a name change, is the fact that each year the President must request a special waiver in order for China to get whatever we want to call this special trade treatment that it receives. It is special for them because they do not have a market economy, and therefore, the President must request a special waiver.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has a resolution to deny the waiver, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes. Let me tell them why. Just on the basis of trade alone, how can we think about giving China normal trade relations when China does not give us any such thing?

We have heard the statistics that in 1998, the trade deficit was about \$58 billion with China. It is higher this year. Over \$1 billion a week, over \$1 billion a week, is lost because of China's unfair trade practices.

I wanted to call to my colleagues' attention, when the business community comes around, and indeed they do, to tell us how trade with China has grown, I want to show my colleagues just how it has grown. It has not grown so much in terms of exports to China.

In fact, our exports to China are practically stagnating, the increase is so minuscule. However, on the imports from China, the increase is so staggering as to be overwhelming, as be beyond explanation.

When we started this debate around the time of Tiananmen Square, the trade deficit for that year was going to be \$6 billion. For this year, it will be over \$67 billion. What is missing in this picture? Who are the mad geniuses who have said that if we give MFN to China year in and year out, our trade will increase? Yes, indeed, it has, our imports from China, not our exports to China.

Our exports to China are important. As I said earlier, this is an odd coalition that we have going here, people who have not agreed on other points. By and large, I represent a city built on trade. I have voted for fast track under President Bush and NAFTA under President Clinton and the rest. But something is very wrong about a policy that allows a country to do this. Let me read what is considered to be normal by those advocates for the Chinese regime.

They think it is normal, and do Members think it is normal, when the U.S. trade deficit is surging every year, again, as I said, over \$67 billion in 1999, is it normal that China continues to maintain barriers to U.S. goods and services entering the Chinese market, including high tariffs, pervasive non-tariff barriers and non-transparent barriers, non-transparent trade rules and regulations, restrictions on trading and distribution rights, restrictive government procurement practices, and restrictions on investment?

I enumerate those because every possible way that we could gain something in trading with China is restricted to us.

Is it normal that China continues to pirate U.S. intellectual property to the tune of about \$2.5 billion in lost sales in 1998? That is not from me, that is from the International Intellectual Property Alliance. And China continues to utilize forced labor for production of exports to the United States, in violation of U.S. law.

Is it normal that China demands technology transfer? And therein lies the biggest danger to our own economy's future. China demands a technology transfer. That is our intellectual property, too, our know-how. That is what we tell the American worker is our economic competitive advantage in the international markets. Yet, China is demanding that that technology be transferred to China.

So if we want to sell products in China, we must produce them there, okay? So that is production transfer. That is one thing. But technology transfer says, and besides, you have to give us all of your designs on what you are making. Now we are your major competitor for our own market. You can produce in China, but that, Mr. Chairman, will have to be to export to another country. We are saving the

Chinese market for the Chinese manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say, to compare this trade relationship, which is unfair in every respect, let us see what the trade deficit would be in a free marketplace, but do not restrict U.S. products going into China having high barriers, and then say that this is going to lead to human rights in China, it is going to lead to all these good things, when it is not even leading to a decent balance of payments for the United States.

I just wanted to point out to my colleague another point. That is, all of this hoop-de-doo about all of the trade with China, just let us talk about the exports, again. China has 1.2 billion people. Now, many, many of them are poor, and I always support assistance for basic human needs for poor people in China. So this is not about the Chinese people, it is about the Chinese regime.

The Chinese regime, which controls many of the industries in China, to China we export 2.8 percent of our exports. Now, look over here. Belgium has 10 million people, 10 million people. We export 3.3 percent of our exports to Belgium. It is 3.3 to Belgium, 10 million people, and 2.8 to China, 1.2 billion people.

Let us look at Taiwan. They have 20 million people. We export 4.1 percent of our exports to Taiwan. Get it? It is not about free trade, it is about barriers to products made in America going into China.

Opponents, those who oppose our efforts tomorrow will say that we want to isolate China, and to vote for the Rohrabacher amendment is to isolate China. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, those who say that, and some of them in the highest places in our government, do a grave disservice to the issue by trying to caricaturize it that way.

We certainly do not want to isolate China. Especially we do not want to isolate the Chinese people. The answer to every problem practically in our relationship with China is that the situation would be better if China were more democratic, if the people of China were able to choose their form of government, their form of worship, their form of assembly, their freedom of speech.

The issue of Taiwan certainly would be better if China were more democratic. The issue of doing business in China would be better if China had rule of law. The issue of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to rogue states I think would be improved, too. On that point I will close my remarks.

The administration and others who rationalize their support for a purposeful principled engagement with our eyes wide open will tell us that China is helping us on some very strategic issues worldwide. For instance, they will say that China is helping to stabilize South Asia. Oh, really? China is not trying to stabilize South Asia,

China has mobilized Pakistan. Without the cooperation of the Chinese, the Pakistanis would not have the missile and other dangerous technologies that they have, and they continue to assist them, the Pakistanis. There is absolutely no question about that.

So that has added to the instability in South Asia. Every time they agreed to stop doing it, they said they did not do it, they would stop doing it, would not do it anymore, and continued to do it. That started in the Bush years and continued in the Clinton years.

Now we have them saying, those who support this policy, saying they are helping us with North Korea, to stop their missile development program. Either they are not trying very hard or they have failed to intercede, or they are not very effective. But in any case, North Korea is proceeding apace with its missile program, and not only that, they are selling to Pakistan technologies that they have received from China.

So this is not about how they are helping us in North Korea. If they were helping in North Korea, it would be in their own interest, anyway. We do not have to bribe them by ignoring their human rights abuses in order for them to do what is right as far as North Korea is concerned, if they are a responsible so-called strategic partner.

They still continue to make the Persian Gulf area a very dangerous neighborhood. We all know that we have a national interest in the Persian Gulf because of oil. We went to war because of that. Our young people are still in the Persian Gulf. When they are, they are looking right at missile technology, C-801 and C-802, sold to the Iranians by the Chinese, and other dangerous technology as well.

So I think that our policy with any country should be to make the trade fairer, to make the people freer, and to make the world safer. On all three of these scores this policy has failed.

So what we are asking our colleagues to do is, we know most-favored-nation status, so-called normal trade relations, is not going to be revoked. The President would never allow that to happen. But what we can do tomorrow is to send a message to Beijing that the people in prison have not been forgotten, that we are not stupid when it comes to our own trade relationships. Even though the exporting elites run the show around here, there are some people who can add.

Then, in terms of proliferation, our national security is at stake, and that we know what they are saying is not true, and they can blame it on whom-ever they want, but their government is either responsible for the proliferation, or else they are not capable of signing an agreement about proliferation. But somehow or other, they must be responsible or unaccountable, but they cannot be both at one time.

That is why I was so pleased that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) extended the invitation to

speaking about this issue a little more at length that we will have on the floor tomorrow. Let us remove all doubt, this is not about isolating China, it is about pro engagement with the people of China; that we do not accept the premise that increased trade will lead to more personal freedoms, more democratic freedoms in China. For 10 years they have been singing that song, and it has not worked. And in any event we do not subscribe to a principle of trickle-down liberty, anyway.

What we want is a brilliant future with China economically, politically, diplomatically, culturally, in every way. That can only happen when China treats its people with the respect that they deserve, and then we will have an engagement that is sustainable of our national values, sustainable of our own economy, and sustainable of international security.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman from California. As she has pointed out in the past, other years leading up to the vote on what was called before MFN, most-favored-nation status, the Chinese have done a few nice things. They might help us a little bit on foreign policy.

□ 2230

They might release some prisoners, some political prisoners. But this year, interestingly, as time has approached for the most favored nation status, the Chinese Communists are so arrogantly confident that they are going to win this vote in this Congress, that they have not released any prisoners. They have actually arrested at least 10,000 religious people simply practicing their religion. They put more people in camps. They have gone the opposite direction.

That is why it is so important, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) says, that our colleagues send messages to the Chinese Communists that we do not like what they are doing.

Now, we know that we are not going to win this vote tomorrow. But if we lose this vote overwhelmingly, we know we are not going to get most favored nation status put aside, but we know if we lose overwhelmingly, it simply says to the Chinese, keep doing what you are doing because nobody in this country cares. That is why it is so important.

One more point the gentlewoman from California made is she suggested so much of this whole policy with China is shrouded in myths. The gentlewoman had mentioned that the Chinese Government supposedly is helping us stabilize South Asia, and that is clearly a myth that she exploded. The gentlewoman has said that the opponents accuse us of wanting to isolate China from us and from the rest of the world. That clearly is not true.

Another myth is that the Chinese have been there to help us in North

Korea in a very destabilizing or unstable situation. The gentlewoman exploded that myth.

The other myth that we hear over and over, and I have heard the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) talk about so many times, is how, if we engage with China, that democracy will come to that country, the more business development, the more economic interaction, the more trade between the two countries, that China will become a freer country.

Yet, when we look at the last 10 years since Tiananmen Square, when we look at everything from the trade deficits to the forced abortions to the selling of weapons to Pakistan, nuclear ring technology to Pakistan, to smuggling AK-47s into the harbor in the city of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), to all the kinds of persecution of religious minorities, to what they have done in Tibet, all of those things beg that question, are things getting better? Is China getting more democratic because we are engaging with them?

There is clearly no evidence that China has gotten more democratic as we engage with them. In fact, what we really are doing is strengthening the People's Liberation Army and strengthening the Communist party leaders in China.

Why are we so naive when we look at history with Nazi Germany as they grew and got more developed and economically better off and got to be a stronger wealthier country. They used that economic power and that technology and that wealth to kill more Jews, to kill more gypsies, to declare war on more countries, to engage in the kind of militarist kind of expansionism that they were so well known for.

The same issue goes on with the Chinese. Just simply looking at it in the simplest way, why should the Chinese change the way they do things when they get most favored nation status and they get these economic benefits from the United States? That is what the Chinese Communist leaders, they like the system this way. Clearly, they have benefited from this system. The PLA, the People's Liberation Army, they benefit from the system this way. They do not want democracy. The American corporate leaders, the investors in the major corporations, they benefit from Chinese policy this way.

So the people that are really running this policy, the U.S. corporate executives, the People's Liberation Army, and the Chinese Communist leaders, they like the system the way it is. They do not want democracy. The People's Liberation Army does not want democracy.

The corporate leaders in the United States that invest in China do not want labor unions to form in China. They do not want free movement of workers at their choice, moving around at the workers' choice. They do not want the kind of things that we believe in this

country and the American values that we hold so dearly.

So why should more prosperity for the leaders in China, the top government officials, the top leaders and the generals and the colonels in the People's Liberation Army and the U.S. company executives, why should more money there make them want democracy more? They like the system the way it works.

I think the proof of that is, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and I have talked many times, is if one looks back in February of 1989, the U.S. State Department issues a report every year about human rights around the world. If one looks, I was leafing through this report, it is a pretty long report, it is country by country. It is called the Country Reports on Human Rights. The State Department uses language talking about Serbia and Kosovo, the treatment of the Kosovars by the Serbs, by the Yugoslav government.

They also, if we flip a few pages forward, and we look at the language we describe, the Chinese Government's treatment of Tibetans, and the language is almost identical paragraph by paragraph.

We declared and bombed Serbia because of their treatment of Kosovo and their treatment of people in Kosovo, yet we give trade advantages to China when they are treating their Tibetan minorities almost exactly the same way.

What kind of coherent government policy is that when we bomb one country and we give trade advantages to another for almost the exact same behavior as interpreted by our government. This is not some whacko group. This is the U.S. Government State Department saying we are treating people, and that the Serbs treat people in Kosovo the same way that Beijing government treats people in Tibet. It is morally bankrupt and absolutely incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, picking up on what the gentleman from Ohio said, he reminded me that we were willing to raise an Army to redress human rights violations in Yugoslavia, and now we will not, they do not want us to raise a tariff to protect human rights in China, and indeed criticize us for raising our voices against China.

The fact is that the policy has failed. They have to blame it on someone, so they say we keep bringing this up so we are demonizing China. No, we are not. In the words of Harry Truman, "I am not giving them hell. I am just describing it, and it seems like hell." We are not demonizing them. We are just telling it the way it is. If that sounds bad, that is not our fault. That is what is going on there.

I did want to call to the attention of our colleagues the letter from the Department of Social Development and World Peace of the U.S. Catholic Con-

ference of Bishops, which was sent to all Members asking for them to vote against the special waiver and in favor of the resolution of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) tomorrow.

I also wanted to call to the attention of our colleagues just in terms of expression of religion that the Falung Gong, imagine any other country in the world, if 10,000 people were arrested in the week, what the clamor would be on the floor of Congress and what the White House would be saying about our values and the rest of that, but it is practically ignored. Because money speaks so loudly, it is so deafening that people cannot hear these cries.

But we want the government in Beijing, we want them to get the message that this action has been noticed, that these people will not be forgotten. Many of the messages that we are receiving are that the Falung Gong members had no food, no drink, no medical attention for 5 days. They are in a very difficult situation.

I received this letter from my district, the Bay area Chinese newspaper today in the San Francisco Bay area reported that China has arrested 1,200 party officials and is forcing them to read the guidelines of the party and to abandon the Falung Gong practice. They are sending them to these reeducation schools, all of them in the same place, to indoctrinate them.

So it is they who are so cowardly because they are so frightened. The regime is so frightened because they have no legitimacy. Their power springs from the barrel of a gun, and that is where it is.

So the peaceful evolution that the gentleman from Ohio described of economic reform leading to political reform can only happen, and sometimes does happen, if it is allowed to happen. But if it is perceived as an evil, as it is in China, and it is prevented from happening, then the consequences to those who want to speak out more democratically will obviously be repressed, as they have been a couple of hundred of pro-democracy people wanting to form other democratic parties in China have been arrested at the same time as this Falung Gong arrests have been taking place.

So the situation that the gentleman from Ohio describes in the country report of the State Department, China, Yugoslavia, Tibet, Kosovo is so similar. Now I do not want anybody declaring war on anybody. I mean, violence to me should be obsolete.

But the fact is, if we are going to have any respect for our moral authority, any respect for our values, we have to have some level of consistency and at least on how we speak out and how we use our leverage, our incredible over \$60 billion leverage this year to promote democratic themes which will benefit, not only the people of China, but the people of the world.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if we think about what the gentlewoman

from California just said, the message that this country and the NATO forces sent to Slobodan Milosevic was, do not do what you are doing in Kosovo. No ethnic cleansing, no waging war against your people, no throwing people into prison, no violence, no more of that kind of activity.

The message that we are sending to Chinese Communist leaders for what they do to the Tibetans and what they do in slave labor camps is, it is okay. We do not care. In fact, we might even reward it by giving you trade advantages and letting you into the World of Nations.

I ask the gentlewoman from California to tell us, she in the past has been so involved in this issue for her entire 13 years as a Member of this body, I think it is so important to send a message to our colleagues. But the gentlewoman has recounted in other years, prior to the vote, the Chinese Government has released a few prisoners here and there. This year, it is the exact opposite. I ask the gentlewoman from California to recount that if she would to our colleagues who need to understand how important it is to send that message that the Chinese Communist party behavior is absolutely unacceptable.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for reminding me of his other question that he expressed earlier.

The leverage that we have in this debate, and that is why we bring it up every year, is that of course we are always hopeful that, as people open their eyes, they will open them up further and see that the policy is not working.

But one of the benefits of bringing it to the floor has always been that, when most favored nation status was in doubt, when Democrats, before we had a Democratic President, were voting against most favored nation status for China, and when it was in doubt, each year, the Chinese Government would release prisoners leading up to the time of the debate.

Chinese prisoners have said to us that their conditions improved markedly at a time when they thought the most favored nation status was in doubt. The very minute that MFN was delinked and then the vote became less, shall we say, of a message to Beijing and the Clinton administration, then the Chinese knew that they could proceed with impunity, and they no longer have to make any concessions to anyone, because they have known what Members of Congress have told me in this body. It does not matter what China does, we will never support sanctions on China. How can that be? But it is.

So that is what is lost in all of this is the prospect for a change in policy, always improve the conditions for the prisoners, lead to the release of some prisoners.

But that idea that MFN or NTR, whatever my colleagues want to call it, is in doubt, that is gone. So the Chi-

nese now say to the moderates among them, we do not have to do anything. And they do not. That is the tragedy.

I used to say of President Bush, he never missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity to send a message to the Chinese about what our policy should be and what our values were in terms of human rights, in terms of our own economy, and in terms of our interest in national security. President Clinton has followed that path, although we were hopeful that he might not. So that is what is lost on this.

If I may say if, God willing it will not happen, but if this body ever entertains the notion of permanent MFN for China, we would be surrendering all leverage in terms of trade, proliferation, and human rights. Indeed, the biggest tool that the trade representative has in the negotiations on the World Trade Organization is permanent MFN. Certainly that should never happen until the situation is very changed in China.

But all of these notions about trade, increasing this, this, and this will only happen if the regime will allow it. What is happening, instead, is that the regime is emboldened and enriched by a \$60 billion per year in the trade surplus. I might say, in the Clinton years alone, over \$300 billion of surplus by the end of this year to the Chinese regime. There must be a better way. There must be a better way.

But we are squandering all of our leverage in order to meet the lobbying efforts of the exporting elites in whose interest it is.

I went back and got this book because it is a resource book from the Chamber of Commerce. What is interesting to me is they talk about all the good things that will spring from normal trade relations with China.

□ 2245

They have been singing this tune for 10 years that I know of at least, and it is all will, will, will, will. It is not about have or is benefiting U.S. So they have been squandering our leverage on the come, on what they hope will come sometime down the road in this great mirage, without a great deal to show for it in the present.

Here is the book, and it says, on page after page, will trade with China, will build a brighter future for America, will power the future of America's high-tech industry, will drive America's automobile industry, will help raise U.S. exports, will help beef up American exports. And it goes on and on like that, and I keep thinking when is it ever going to occur to them that they have been singing this song too long. What fascinates me even more is that people buy it. But I guess hope springs eternal.

In any event, let us give this policy a chance that says, of course we want to have engagement with China, but with our eyes open, truly, and not some new name that will change tomorrow on a policy that has not been successful and has been bipartisan in its failure.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What is so ironic during this process is that China wants to be a member of the World Trade Organization, to be accepted in the community of nations permanently. Yet during this last 3 or 4 or 5 years that they have been wooing the United States and other countries into admission or accession into the WTO, look at their behavior, everything from the nuclear ring technology to Pakistan, to slave labor, to child labor, to the closing of the markets, to the forced abortions, to the persecution of Christians, and the human rights violations. That is their behavior when they have been wooing us, when they want admission into this organization, when they want WTO accession. Once they are in, and I hope they are never in the World Trade Organization, then we will have no leverage with them.

That is another debate for another day, but that is so important to understand, that their behavior has been so outrageous and so outside the mainstream of world values and world opinions and world behavior that it is just remarkable that this body wants to include them in any of these organizations.

Ms. PELOSI. If the gentleman will yield on that point. I just want to add this further point, and that is that the trade representative herself has said if a country does not want to comply with the World Trade Organization regulations, there is really not much we can do about it.

And China has really received the message from the world that nobody is going to step up to the plate, because the too-big-to-fail doctrine is in effect. All the countries want their piece of the trade. Of course they are buying. China is buying from them; they are selling to us. They take the money they make on our trade, go buy stuff in other countries, win their political support in all the other world bodies, diminishing anything we could possibly do in a multilateral body in terms of human rights or other issues.

So the World Trade Organization only will work if the members coming in are of good faith. An economy as big as China's coming into the WTO, which refuses to play by the rules, if that country refuses to play by the rules, can wreck the WTO and wreck some of the western democratic economies as well, and that is really serious.

But we are in this immediate gratification stage for certain businesses in America. There is nothing long term about values, our economy or international security.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman from California, and I simply want to close with an exhortation to our Members to vote in support of the Rohrabacher resolution tomorrow which will deny Most Favored Nation status to China.

The importance of a "yes" vote tomorrow in support of the Rohrabacher resolution is to send a message to the Chinese that the kind of behavior from

persecution of people practicing their religion, to closing of their markets, to human rights violations, to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the only way to get the message that this body is unhappy and does not tolerate that kind of behavior is a "yes" vote tomorrow on the Rohrabacher resolution.

CHINA AND MFN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for half the time until midnight.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks we have just heard concerning the vote that will be coming up tomorrow on Most Favored Nation status, or as it is now referred to, normal trade relations, with the Communist government of China.

Let me just say for the record that this is a bipartisan effort. As we can see tonight, some people on the other side of the aisle have been very active; some people on my side of the aisle have been very active.

Perhaps one of the greatest disappointments I have had with this administration is that during President Bush's term in office I was very disappointed in his policies toward Communist China and, in fact, after Tiananmen Square was bitterly disappointed in how we took that and the positions we were taking in response to the massacre of democracy advocates in Tiananmen Square.

When George Bush lost the election in 1992 to president elect Clinton, I thought to myself, well, at least here is someone that I will be able to work with on the issue of human rights. Unfortunately, I had bought in to President Clinton's posturing on human rights. And I might add, unfortunately, all of us who have been active in the human rights arena have been disappointed with this administration. I personally feel that this administration has been the most anti-human rights administration in my lifetime, and it certainly has undermined the tough stands made by President Reagan and President Jimmy Carter, and has even superceded George Bush in the area of human rights.

For example, in China, this President has decoupled trade negotiations with China in relationship to anything to do with human rights. The administration no longer has that as part of its negotiating position. This President personally decided to make that decoupling. Had a Republican president done that, I imagine people would remember it a great deal more because there would have been a much greater fracas caused by that.

But tomorrow we will again address this issue that has been one that has gone on every year since my election to Congress, and tomorrow the House

will debate legislation that has been introduced. However, it will be my legislation that will be debated. And that, of course, makes me feel a bit humble. I remember the time when I came into this body 10 years ago when I could not have dreamed of having a piece of my legislation being the focal point of a major day's work of the United States Congress. But I have introduced legislation that will disapprove of the extension of so-called normal trade relations with Communist China, which was previously known as Most Favored Nation status.

For the past 10 years, since the massacre of the democracy advocates at Tiananmen Square, and by the way, let us remember that the folks over in Beijing, the same people who have been in charge, the same gang that has been in charge, those people still deny that there was ever a massacre at Tiananmen Square of democracy advocates. But since then, the Congress has undertaken this debate every year, but there has been little change in the repression that is taking place in China.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) outlined that these are the very same arguments that we will hear tomorrow by the advocates of normal trade relations with Communist China. These are the very same arguments that have been offered year after year after year after year.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), asked earlier on in his remarks what must happen for these people who come to this floor and suggest that there will be progress made on the human rights front; that there will be a liberalization; that there will be a change in their belligerency; that there will be positive steps taken and recognizable steps taken if we just engage them in this trade policy, what more does China have to do? How much longer will it be before these folks who advocate these positions with all of their heart and with all of their sincerity, how much longer will it take, how much more must China do before they admit they are wrong? They are dead wrong, and it is clear to everyone that they are wrong.

I personally could not come and advocate those policies, that I believed perhaps were right, if they had continued over a 10-year period to go in exactly the opposite direction than what my predictions were. I, in fact, would suggest that if tomorrow a revolt broke out in Tibet and that nuclear weapons were dropped by the Communist Chinese Government on Tibet, annihilating hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Tibetans, we would still hear from these folks on the floor of the House of Representatives that if we just continue to engage them in this trade policy, that the policies followed by the government in Beijing are bound to liberalize and that the government in Beijing will become more civilized by their association with us.

I believe that they could murder every last Christian in China, they

could murder every last Tibetan, they could commit genocide against every Muslim out in the far reaches of China, who they are also murdering, they could take every one of the 70 million member group, who are nothing more than a movement of people who believe in meditation and believe in exercise, as is consistent with Chinese tradition, they could murder every one of those people and we would still have on the floor of this House people advocating that we continue on with the same policy year after year after year after year.

Well, something is wrong. Something is wrong, and it does not take a rocket scientist to know that something is wrong. It certainly might take a rocket scientist, however, to know exactly how much damage has been done to us that we have discovered in the last year. Because in this last year we have found out that since the last vote on Most Favored Nation status with China the Communist government in Beijing has managed to get their hands on, through theft and other methods, of our most deadly weapons secrets. They now have the ability to produce miniaturized nuclear weapons. They have the ability to produce these weapons of mass destruction.

And our own companies are overseas telling them and teaching them how to upgrade their missile capacity and their missile capability so that they can more accurately target American cities with these weapons of mass destruction.

Now, it is the theory of those who advocate most-favored-nation status that the world will be a safer place if we have this trade with China. But as we can see, that not only is the world not a safer place as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has pointed out, Communist China is the source of this deadly weapons technology to Korea, to Iran, to other Third World rogue nations, but not only that, not only is the world not a safer place, the United States is not a safer place because of this. Our own country now faces the prospect of our companies who have gone over there to liberalize China and make them more pleasant, make them more consistent with the civilized values of the western world, our own companies have gone over there and they have been corrupted themselves to the point that they have armed our worst potential enemy with weapons that could incinerate tens of millions if not hundreds of millions of American citizens.

There is something wrong with this policy. There is something dreadfully wrong. What more needs to be done before people will come on the floor of this House and will admit that that policy does not work? Year after year after year the same arguments, yet the empirical evidence suggests that they are going in the wrong direction. Making matters worse, as China has gone in the wrong direction, as China has kept up its roadblocks to the importation of American goods, kept up its

high tariffs, used the surplus that it is generating by its tariffs on our goods and taking advantage of the low tariffs in exporting their goods to the United States, taking the tens of billions of dollars that they have earned and while they are using that money to modernize their weapons, to aim it at the United States, we have an administration that insists on calling Communist China, again the world's worst human rights abuser, is being called our strategic partner.

If we do not change our policy towards the world's worst human rights abuser, Americans will pay a woeful price. It will not be just the Tibetans who will be slaughtered but it will be the American people, not just losing their jobs as we have shown in this testimony before us this evening, we have shown how our ability to compete with China and the slave labor prices in China and the slave labor wages in China, our ability has been cut down as we export technology to that country. Yes, we are paying an economic price. The Tibetans are paying a price with their lives as are the Muslims in that country, as are the dissidents in that country. But if we keep up this policy, the American people will pay a woeful price for this irrational, immoral and greed-driven policy that is putting us in grave jeopardy to a country that is controlled by gangsters and despots.

The time, Mr. Speaker, has long since passed when the United States should reexamine these fundamental policies toward the Communist dictatorship that rules the mainland of China. Our commercial policies as well as our diplomatic and military policies have for the past decade worked against the interests of our people and has not, as we had hoped, increased the level of freedom enjoyed by the Chinese people. In fact, after some initial progress, China has gone in the opposite direction, as I have just described, especially since the end of the Reagan administration and the tragic national reversal that took place in Tiananmen Square.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) defines insanity as doing more of the same and expecting to get different results. Here I have been describing it tonight. The same policies are being advocated over and over again, but yet these folks ask us to believe that this time around, there are going to be different results. I do not believe there will be different results if we continue this policy with Communist China. I believe our country will just be in more jeopardy and that in the end we will reach a threshold in our economic relationship with China where it causes great economic damage to our country as well as the national security damage, which is already becoming evident. It is at the least unreasonable, perhaps, and what we are talking about at the least is irrational optimism for these people to continue advocating this position.

I think that it is up to us to advocate what we believe in, and I certainly re-

spect people with different opinions. But the American people should pay close attention to the debate that is going on here tomorrow. We must understand that since this debate started 10 years ago, the genocide has continued in Tibet, the Chinese democracy movement was wiped out, and there has been an increasing belligerence of the guys who run—the bully boys, I say, of Beijing—toward the United States, towards Taiwan, towards the Philippines.

Now, big business falsely claims that China will be liberalizing through this commercial engagement. As I have said, there is no evidence of that. The evidence goes exactly the opposite direction. China, as we heard from the gentlewoman from California, is exporting its weapons technology to various rogue nations.

Let me just add, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I was shocked to find out that Communist China is aiding the North Koreans in their, quote, space efforts, in their space program. North Korea has a space program? Give me a break. North Korea has a space program? Here we are shipping North Korea hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign aid, our biggest recipient in Asia, and they are spending their money on a space program in which Communist China is taking the technology that they stole from us, or was given to them by our own aerospace firms, illegally, I might add, and they are building these rockets in the name of a space program.

How many people who read this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or listen tonight on C-SPAN believe that North Korea is really developing these rockets to launch civilian satellites but are not, which we know that probably is the case, that the North Koreans, with the Chinese help, are developing missiles in order to intimidate Japan and intimidate the democratic peoples in the Pacific, and unfortunately also to intimidate the United States because many of these rockets in North Korea and in China, thanks to our own companies, like Hughes and Loral, are now more capable of being more accurate in their targeting of American cities.

What we have in our China policy is a catastrophe, a catastrophe for the United States of America in the making. We see this with the money that the Communist Chinese have left over, and as the gentlewoman from California said, what type of normal trade relationship is it when they have barriers to our goods and high tariffs to our goods and we let them ship all of their goods into our country with very little tariff? With the surplus that they have from that, they are in Panama, they are in North Korea, they are modernizing their weapons, they are creating havoc throughout the world and they are putting the world in a position where we could have a catastrophe in which millions of lives are lost and we could face a catastrophe where the United States is put in grave danger. It

is in grave danger today. We must change that policy for a number of reasons.

Let us go in now to what this means, what the policy is that we are talking about. Why is normal trade relations being proposed, then? Why do we have large financial interests who are pushing for that? If you examine what the trade is, what we have been talking about tonight, not only do we not have free trade, and the proponents will say, "Well, we're free traders." My Republican colleagues will say, "We're free traders."

Well, I am sorry that that is not free trade. We are not talking about free trade. There is no such thing as free trade when on one side of the trading partnership you have a country which permits in all of the goods imported from the other country at 3 percent tariffs and with very few restrictions and the other country, Communist China, putting barriers up and controlling who gets to come over and who gets to buy and sell in their market. You have got a controlled economy here and controlled trade on this side and relatively free and open trade over here. That is not a free trade equation. A free trade equation is when you have free trade on both sides. No, this is an equation that is a one-way free trade, one-way controlled trade equation. When you do it that way, you leave the outcome, the results, not to a free expression of the market between the countries but instead you leave it up to some gangsters who run a tyrannical regime in Beijing, you leave it to them as to what will be the results of that trade, because you have permitted them to manipulate it while leaving it somewhat open on our side.

This is not about free trade. No, it is about managed trade on the side of the Communist Chinese regime so that they can get the \$70 billion surplus and they can channel money and power in China to their clique. We are actually strengthening the dictatorship in Communist China by going along with this nonsense that they talk about of free trade, because it is not free trade.

I personally believe in free trade. I would advocate it. It is called free trade between free people. If you do not have free trade between free people, it is a non sequitur, it does not exist, for a one-way free trade is not a free trade equation.

□ 2310

But then why are these companies here? If you take a look even to that degree of what we supposedly export to China, once you take a look at what those exports are, you know we have several think tanks in this town that have done studies of this, and I believe it was the Heritage Foundation that did the most extensive study and reported that there is almost no trade going on with China in which American products are manufactured here and sold to the people over there. That is not what is going on.

Now you are going to have a lot of people come to this floor tomorrow who will be saying, oh, we have got to take advantage of the China market, we need its jobs for the people of the United States, and we have got to make sure that we do not let other people sell their products there when we should be selling American products.

I hope people listen to those arguments because that argument is totally fallacious. What the facts are behind that argument is enough to curl your hair. What is being sold to China are not American products that are being produced in the United States and sold to the Chinese consumers. What is being sold there that makes this trade surplus on the part of the Chinese even worse is what we are selling to them are factories and technology, and we are building their industrial infrastructure so that, as my colleagues know, on our side of the equation what we are selling them is the long-term process and the long-term technology they will need to destroy us economically and militarily and in every other way. We are giving the Communist Chinese tens of billions of dollars, and in our side of the equation our people are making money not on selling commercial items to the Chinese and building their standard of living. We are selling them factories.

I come from a very heavy aerospace area, and we sell airplanes to Communist China. But what the companies do not want you to know and do not want to focus on is that the Chinese are insisting if we buy your airplanes, you got to help set up airplane building factories in our country, and over the past 10 years we have set up almost an entire infrastructure in Communist China so that they can come back and put our aerospace workers out of work.

Oh, that is only the first layer of this cake. The second layer is: What else is there in this? What are we talking about here when these businessmen go over there and are setting up those factories? The reason they must have normal trade relations or most favored nation status, as we used to call it, is so that they will be eligible for taxpayer subsidies. Now is this free trade?

Now I heard the word "subsidy" mentioned here. I thought that I am a protectionist, that Rohrabacher and his gang are protectionists, and the other people are free traders. But where does subsidy come into the free trade equation? No, they have to have most favored nation status or normal trade relation status tomorrow, passed tomorrow, so that when a factory owner in the United States wants to close his factory, he will then be eligible if he wants to relocate it in Communist China to take advantage of slave wages over there, no unions, no freedom, no environmental controls. When he wants to do that and put our people out of work, he might need to get a loan. He might need to get a loan. Otherwise he would have to risk his own capital; and, my gosh, when you are doing that

in a Communist country, that is a pretty bad risk.

Now, if you give him most favored nation status or normal trade relations, he can get a guarantee through the Export-Import Bank or any number of financial institutions that can traced right back to the American taxpayers' pocket, and they will guarantee the loan or they will subsidize the interest rate. We are subsidizing and we are encouraging American businessmen to go to Communist China and build the industrial infrastructure to put our people out of work. That is what we are voting on tomorrow.

Now we will be told that, no, we are voting on whether or not we are going to engage China or whether we are going to be able to trade with China. No, no. Let us ask. Everyone who hears that argument tomorrow, ask yourselves if this does not pass, will Americans be free too sell their goods in China? Of course they will. Americans will be able to sell their goods in China just as if they will be able to do it today.

Unfortunately, the Chinese have those roadblocks, but the difference will be if an American industrialist wants to set up a plant in China, he is going to have to do so on his own risk. He is going to have to do so using his own money rather than the taxpayers' money. That is the difference. That is what we are voting on tomorrow.

No wonder why these powerful interest groups want us to vote for most favored nation status, not normal trade relations. Of course they want to have the taxpayers pick it up, because they do not want to risk their money putting their money into a dictatorship.

You know, I will tell you something about the American people. If it was not for the American people, there would not be any freedom on this planet. To the degree there is freedom anywhere on this planet and stability anywhere on this planet it is because guys like who went out to save Private Ryan went out and did it, because the American people believe in freedom and democracy and justice, believe in the type of honest and fair government, believe in democracy, believe in what Thomas Jefferson said, believe that rights belong to everyone.

To the degree that we have gone all over the world and we have stood firm for those principles is to the degree freedom has succeeded around the world, and the American people, the American working people, deserve to have somebody watching out for their interests. They do not deserve to have some industrialist who says, oh boy, I can be here in the United States and make my money, and that is all because of the protection of these decent hard-working American people; but I am going to take that for granted, and I am going to go over there to Communist China, and I am going to invest over there because they know over in Communist China without some kind of guarantee their government is so

corrupt and so tyrannical, this can be taken away from them, and it is only because of the decency and honor of the American people that we do not have that kind of oppression and instability here in our own country.

But who are they hurting when they invest over there? And it is a slap in the face, they are investing over there, and they are using tax dollars from our own working people to guarantee those investments. Something is dreadfully wrong; something is dreadfully wrong.

Now I do not deny that there are a lot of people who probably think that they are telling the story as they honestly believe it, and I am sure they must believe it. But how much longer can it go on and keep going in the opposite direction?

We have a situation today where this, and this just happened the last 2 weeks. As my colleagues know, we have been told things are getting better in China, and now all of a sudden tens of thousands of people who are just members of sort of a quasi-religious movement that they exercise in the parks. I have seen them. And it is a yoga-type of exercise. It is with Buddhism and Taoism put together, and these people and this movement, they have now been targeted, targeted by the Communist Chinese Party, and they are being arrested by the thousands.

Now remember this. We have had people lobbying, lobbying this Congress for this upcoming vote tomorrow, telling us that we should vote for this because it is going to help the Christians, and the Chinese Communists have said one thing. They have said one thing. Anybody can worship God in Communist China as long as you register with the state, sort of like the Nazis said to the Jews. You just have to register. Trust us, you will be okay. And now we have that same regime who Billy Graham and these others have told us we must, as my colleagues know, not deny them this trade status because it will hurt Christians, and all Christians have to do is register.

We have had our own religious leaders over there encouraging them to register, to register with the government. On my, my, my. The history in Communist China, you have seen this happen time and again where you have people who are being coaxed out into the open, and then it will followed by repression.

□ 2320

Anybody who suggests to a Christian in China or a Muslim in the far-off reaches of China to register with the government is doing a great disservice to our country and a great disservice to those people and a great disservice to the cause of human rights. Our country has to be the champion of human rights and believe in those fundamental values, or we are nothing. Those people themselves, their lives are on the line, and in terms of human rights, we have to have a standard of

human rights where people can worship God without having to register and tell the government what faith they are.

What has happened now? That argument has been underscored, underscored by this attack on what we call the Falung Gong, which is this movement that is under attack, because even a religious movement based on something that is entirely Chinese in culture is being attacked and brutalized in the worst possible way.

Mr. Speaker, there is a real comparison about the days that we live in, and for those people who read history, I think it is time that we should read history about the time of what happened in Asia back in the 1920s. There was another country back in the 1920s who thought, like China, that they were racially superior to all of the others. We had a country back in the 1920s in Asia who thought that they had the right to dominate all of Asia, this huge hunk of Asia; and they felt that they had the will to rule, and they were going to create a prosperity sphere, and everything would be out of one capital and unfortunately at that time it was Tokyo.

The Japanese back in the 1920s had the same policies that we now have in Beijing. They had this image that they had history on their side and they had a right to dominate the planet. And the United States had people who wanted to trade with them. In fact, we traded. We sold them scrap metal, just like Lorel and Hughes traded them secrets for how to build their rockets.

We had lots of commerce with the Nazis. We had industrialists telling us a lot of the same things about the Nazis, the same thing about the Japanese militarists. In the 1920s and the 1930s we let it go. And the Japanese knew one thing: there was only one country in their way, and it was the United States of America. They knew that, and the Communist Chinese clique that runs that country in Beijing knows that the United States of America is all that stands between them and dominating that region, and some day, mark my words, we will see a Chinese Communist move on central Asia and Kazakhstan and that area.

We will see a move toward the north in Siberia and Manchuria. We will see a move to try to dominate the Pacific Basin. We already see that where they are trying to take these islands away from the Philippines, the Spratly Islands, and we will see a move into Southeast Asia. If we just give the Communist Chinese the idea that they can do anything and we will still give them this trade status, they can do anything and we will still call them our strategic partners, we are inviting the very worst elements in China to stay in power and to brutally maintain their control and to move forward with their plans, because we are a bunch of pansies and we are saps, that we will not even protect the interests of our own people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is time to change that policy before it is too late.

We ended up in a war with Japan. We can prevent that with China. We must support the democratic elements in China, and we must not treat China as a democratic country; and we must make our alliances with the people rather than the clique that runs that country. It is up to us. We can make history. We do not have to relive the 1920s and 1930s again.

But if we just blithely ignore reality, if we blithely ignore our country being treated in an unequal way and just ignore the fact that they are modernizing their military at our expense and that we come groveling to them with this unfair trading relationship that gives them all of the advantage and puts our own American people at a disadvantage, because who is representing their interests, the Communists that run China will not respect us. They will loathe us, they will treat us like the weak links we are, and we will pay a price. Unfortunately, we are already close to that.

So tomorrow I would hope that people pay close attention to the debate, and it will be a spirited debate; and it will determine again the policies of the United States of America, because this is still a democratic country where the rule of law and the will of the people will prevail. It is just that we have to get the people active and involved in these issues.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. EHRLICH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of the birth of his son, Drew Robert.

Mrs. CHENOWETH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NADLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOLBE, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRYANT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACHUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1999, at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3217. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 1998-99 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV99-982-1 FIR] received June 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3218. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Modification to Handler Membership on the California Olive Committee [Docket No. FV99-932-2 FIR] received June 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3219. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting notification that a transaction involving U.S. exports to a private company in the

energy sector in Russia is now ready to proceed; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3220. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement regarding a transaction involving a U.S. export to Bulgaria; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3221. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Summary of Expenditures of Rebates from the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Surcharge Escrow Account for Calendar Year 1998," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2120e(d)(2)(E)(ii)(II); to the Committee on Commerce.

3222. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 99-0B, which relates to the Department of the Army's proposed enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability of defense article(s) previously sold to Greece, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5); to the Committee on International Relations.

3223. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Greece for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 99-17), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

3224. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Maryland Regulatory Program [MD-043-FOR] received July 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3225. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change to Delegated State Audit Functions (RIN: 1010-AC51) received July 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3226. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Federal Housing and Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Debt Collection (RIN: 2550-AA07) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3227. A letter from the Attorney for National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene and MacRae, L.L.P., transmitting the 1998 annual report of independent auditors who have audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to Public Law 88-376, section 14(b) (78 Stat. 323); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3228. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the fiscal year 2000 Capital Investment and Leasing Program of the General Services Administration's Public Buildings Service, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3229. A letter from the Commissioner, General Services Administration, transmitting notification of the status of the National Laboratory Center and the Fire Investigation Research and Education facility proposed for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3230. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Annual Report of the Metals Initiative; to the Committee on Science.

3231. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report on the actuarial status of the railroad retirement system, including any recommendations for financing changes, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 321f-1; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

3232. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 1999 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on July 22, 1999 the following report were filed on July 23, 1999]

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 850. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption; with amendment (Rept. 106-117 pt. 4). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOSS. Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 850. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption; with an amendment (Rept. 106-117 Pt. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PACKARD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2605. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CALLAHAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2606. A bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on July 26, 1999]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 468. A bill to establish the Saint Helena Island National Scenic Area; with an amendment (Rept. 106-255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 695. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to convey an administrative site in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College; with an amendment (Rept. 106-256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 841. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 862. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to implement the provisions of the Agreement conveying title to

a Distribution System from the United States to the Clear Creek Community Services District (Rept. 106-258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 992. A bill to convey the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir to the El Dorado Irrigation District, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1019. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey lands and interests comprising the Carlsbad Irrigation Project to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, New Mexico (Rept. 106-260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2079. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the State of South Dakota (Rept. 106-261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 57. Resolution disapproving the extension of non-discriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China; adversely (Rept. 106-262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 260. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2587) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-263). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 261. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-264). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 2607. A bill to promote the development of the commercial space transportation industry, to authorize appropriations for the Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation, to authorize appropriations for the Office of Space Commercialization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2608. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to clarify the definition of "major drug-transit country" under the international narcotics control program; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 2609. A bill to promote product development and testing in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 2610. A bill to provide an affirmative defense in a civil action brought with respect to a Federal requirement which is potentially in conflict with another Federal requirement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 2611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income the salary of certain teachers who teach in high-poverty schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself and Mr. VISLOSKEY):

H.R. 2612. A bill to expand United States exports of goods and services by requiring the development of objective criteria to achieve market access in foreign countries, to provide the President with reciprocal trade authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

164. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 175 memorializing Congress to enact the same mandated benefits as contained in Act 98 of 1998 in all Federal insurance programs and all federally regulated, self-funded health insurance programs governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

165. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 24 memorializing Congress to adopt legislation mandating that all products containing a steroid ingredient, including over-the-counter products and prescription drugs, be externally labeled as containing a "steroid" ingredient by the manufacturer and include inside the packaging an insert of information; to the Committee on Commerce.

166. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 192 memorializing the President and Congress to support legislation authorizing states to restrict the amount of solid waste being imported from other states and creating a rational solid waste management strategy that is equitable among states and environmentally sound; to the Committee on Commerce.

167. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 25 memorializing the President and the Congress to take whatever steps necessary to initiate talks with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China, Russia and Vietnam for the purpose of obtaining the release of Americans being held against their will; to the Committee on International Relations.

168. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 10 memorializing Congress and the President to use all appropriate legal, diplomatic and economic means to obtain the full cooperation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and other nations in resolving the issue of American soldiers and pilots missing from the Korean War; to the Committee on International Relations.

169. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 memorializing Congress to appropriate for distribution to the counties in the State of Nevada the amount of money necessary to correct the underpayments to those counties pursuant to the Act for the

previous fiscal years; to the Committee on Resources.

170. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 123 memorializing the President and Congress to make the \$1 billion of Federal monies already earmarked for abandoned mine land reclamation available to states to clean up and make safe abandoned mine lands; to the Committee on Resources.

171. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 memorializing Congress to authorize the United States Air Force to withdraw the public land located within the Nellis Air Force Range indefinitely; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Commerce, and Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 82: Mr. COYNE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 119: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 121: Mr. DICKEY and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 135: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 140: Mr. LUTHER.
H.R. 354: Mrs. MYRICK and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 405: Mr. HOFFEL and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 488: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 583: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 614: Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 628: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 664: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 797: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. REYES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. LEE, and Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 798: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 809: Mr. COBURN and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 1055: Mr. WAMP, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1080: Mr. KLINK and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1095: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1102: Mr. NADLER, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. FARR of California.
H.R. 111: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1168: Ms. LEE, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1193: Mr. WEINER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1248: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 1272: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1290: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. LARGENT.
H.R. 1333: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1344: Mr. COMBEST and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1355: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 1358: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1413: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1446: Mr. GORDON and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 1485: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 1624: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1879: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WU, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1814: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1818: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1837: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1841: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1870: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 1907: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 1932: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1993: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 2000: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2121: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2202: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2221: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 2235: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 2245: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 2265: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2303: Mr. CAMBELL.
H.R. 2319: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2339: Mr. MOORE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 2341: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WISE, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GOODE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 2346: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2389: Mr. HILL of Montana and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2418: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 2452: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2454: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 2483: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 2498: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 2534: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2543: Mr. REGULA.
H.R. 2548: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 2555: Mrs. FOWLER.
H.R. 2563: Mr. BATEMAN.
H.R. 2565: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 2567: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. STARK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2571: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 2584: Mr. ROGAN.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. CRANE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FORD.

H. Con. Res. 159: Ms. LEE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CRANE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NEY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. FORD.

H. Res. 172: Mr. METCALF and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII:

39. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Utah Sheriff's Association, relative to USA Resolution 99-1 petitioning against the expansion of the authority, jurisdiction, and scope of federal powers and law enforcement; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2587

OFFERED BY: MR. BILBRAY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 65, insert after line 24 the following:

BANNING POSSESSION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS BY MINORS

SEC. 167. (a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any individual under 18 years of age to possess any cigarette or other tobacco product in the District of Columbia.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) POSSESSION IN COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an individual making a delivery of cigarettes or tobacco products in pursuance of employment.

(2) PARTICIPATION IN LAW ENFORCEMENT OPERATION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an individual possessing products in the course of a valid, supervised law enforcement operation.

(c) PENALTIES.—Any individual who violates subsection (a) shall be subject to the following penalties:

(1) For any violation, the individual may be required to perform community service or attend a tobacco cessation program.

(2) Upon the first violation, the individual shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$50.

(3) Upon the second and each subsequent violation, the individual shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$100.

(4) Upon the third and each subsequent violation, the individual may have his or her driving privileges in the District of Columbia suspended for a period of 90 consecutive days.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply during fiscal year 2000 and each succeeding fiscal year.

H.R. 2587

OFFERED BY: MS. NORTON

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 54, strike lines 19 through 25 (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly).

H.R. 2605

OFFERED BY: MR. COOK

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 17, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

Page 17, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 18, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,442,000)".

Page 18, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 18, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,750,000)".

Page 20, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 21, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

H.R. 2605

OFFERED BY: MR. POMBO

AMENDMENT NO.: Amend Title I to:
Cut \$150,000 from "General Investigations" designated for the Stockton Metropolitan Area and place that amount into "General Construction" for purposes of reimbursing the Stockton Metropolitan Area Flood Control Project, as authorized under Sec. 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-303).

H.R. 2605

OFFERED BY: MR. VISCLOSKEY

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 5, line 25, strike the comma and all that follows through page 6, line 23, and insert a period.

H.R. 2606

OFFERED BY: MR. MOAKLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for programs at the United States Army School of the Americas located at Fort Benning, Georgia.

H.R. 2606

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

SEC. _____. Of the funds appropriated in title II of this Act under the heading "ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION", not more than \$172,000,000 shall be available for the Government of the Russian Federation.

H.R. 2606

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in title II of this Act under the heading "ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION" may be used to carry out programs contained in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative.

H.R. 2606

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in title II of this Act under the heading "ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION" may be used to carry out programs contained in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative.

(b) Of the funds appropriated in title II of this Act under the heading "ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION", not more than \$172,000,000 shall be available for the Government of the Russian Federation.